arXiv:1604.05218v1 [math.AP] 18 Apr 2016

Stabilisation of Damped Waves on Spheres and on Zoll's Surfaces of Revolution

Zhu Hui

April 19, 2016

Abstract

We are interested in the strong stabilisation of damped waves when the geometric control condition is not satisfied. We begin with an unpublished result due to G. Lebeau, of the strong stabilisation of damped waves on $\mathbb{S}^d$, with the damping term being the indicator function of the upper hemisphere $a = 1_{\mathbb{S}^d_+}$. Then we extend this result to Zoll's surfaces of revolution, with the damping term being the indicator function of the upper hemi-surface, which does not satisfy the geometric control condition, either. The proof uses the spectral distribution of the Laplace-Beltrami operator, and estimates of its eigenfunctions.

1 Introduction

1.1 Stabilisation of Damped Waves and Main Results

Consider the Cauchy problem of the damped wave equation on (M, g), a compact Riemannian manifold with or without boundary.

$$(\mathrm{DW}) \begin{cases} \left(\partial_t^2 - \Delta + a\partial_t\right) u = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{D}'\left(\mathbb{R} \times M\right), \\ (u, \partial_t u)_{t=0} = (u_0, u_1) & \in H^1(M) \times L^2(M). \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

When $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, we assume further the Dirichlet's boundary condition. Here $\Delta = \Delta_g$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator to the Riemannian metric g. The function $0 \leq a \in L^\infty(M)$ is non-negative, and the term $a\partial_t u$ is called the damping term, as it causes decay in energy. There is a unique solution to this equation in $C^1\left(\mathbb{R}_t, L^2(M)\right) \cap C^0\left(\mathbb{R}_t, H^1(M)\right)$ by the theorem of Hille-Yosida. The energy defined by

$$E(u, T) = \frac{1}{2} \left\|\nabla u(T)\right\|^2_{L^2(M)} + \frac{1}{2} \left\|\partial_t u(T)\right\|^2_{L^2(M)} \tag{1.2}$$

decays as the time T increases, due to the non-negativity of a and the following identity

$$E(u, T) = E(u, 0) - \int_0^T \int_M a(x) \left|\partial_t u(t, x)\right|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t. \tag{1.3}$$

A natural question to ask is whether, as a consequence of the damping effect, the energy of any solution to (DW) will decay to zero as the time increases to infinity. This is called the "*weak stabilisation property*". The "*strong stabilisation property*", however, queries the possibility of a uniform energy decay of all solutions, or equivalently, a uniform exponential decay of energy (Proposition 2.5).

When $a \in C(M)$, the question of "strong stabilisation" has been answered. [R-T] gave a sufficient condition (the so-called *geometric control condition*) for strong stabilisation when $\partial M = \emptyset$, followed by [B-L-R], who showed that this is in fact an equivalent condition in cases with or without boundary. To state the result, we restrict ourselves to the case $\partial M = \emptyset$, in order to avoid the occurrence of generalised geodesics.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (M, g) be a compact Riemannian manifold without boundary, and $0 \leq a \in C^0(M)$, then the following two statements are equivalent.*

1. *(Strong Stabilisation) There exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ such that for every solution u of (DW), and all $t \geq 0$,*
$$E(u,t) \leq Ce^{-\beta t} E(u,0).$$
2. *(Geometric Control Condition) All geodesics of M enter the open set $\{a > 0\}$, that is, for every $x \in M$ and every geodesic γ starting from x (i.e. $\gamma(0) = x$), $\gamma(t) \in \{a > 0\}$ for some $t \geq 0$.*

The condition posed on a is called the *geometric control condition* because it relates the geometry of the manifold to the controllability of the equation. A similar condition, under this name, is used to characterise the exact control of wave equations, see [B-G]. The proof of Theorem 1.1 in [B-L-R] used the propagation theorem of wave front sets developed by Melrose and Sjöstrand. [Leb] managed to use microlocal defect measures (see [Bur-2] as a reference) and an argument by contradiction to give a new and much simpler proof. However, when $a \in L^\infty(M)$, it remains an open problem to give an equivalent condition for strong stabilisation, even though the following necessary condition and sufficient condition are known.

Proposition 1.2. *Let $a \in L^\infty(M)$, and consider (DW) on M, then*

1. *(Necessary Condition) In order for (DW) to have the strong stabilisation property, all geodesics of M must enter* $\operatorname{supp} a$.
2. *(Sufficient Condition) If all geodesics of M enter the open set*
$$U(a) = \bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} \operatorname{Int}\{x : a(x) > \epsilon\}, \tag{1.4}$$
then (DW) has the strong stabilisation property.

These conditions are classical, following from the proof of Theorem 1.1 where $a \in C^0(M)$, which requires the use of microlocal energy measures, and will not be elaborated here. They are not equivalent, though. For example, let $M = S^2$, and $0 \leq a \in C^0(M)$ satisfying that $a = 0$ exactly on the equator, while $a > 0$ elsewhere. Theorem 1.1 says that (DW) does not have the strong stabilisation property, even though the necessary condition is satisfied. Conversely, let $a = 1_{S^2_+}$ be the indicator function of the upper hemisphere (being closed or open is not relevent), then the equator does not enter $U(a) = \operatorname{Int} S^2_+$. However, the following Theorem 1.4 shows that (DW) does have the strong stabilisation property, because of the symmetry of spherical harmonics.

In view of this proposition, we define the geometric control condition (GCC) for $0 \leq a \in L^\infty(M)$, which extends the condition in Theorem 1.1 where $a \in C^0(M)$, for in that case $U(a) = \{a > 0\}$.

Definition 1.3. We say that $0 \leq a \in L^\infty(M)$ satisfies the geometric control condition, or GCC, if all geodesics of M enter $U(a)$. In particular, we say a subset $F \subset M$ satisfies GCC, if the indicator function 1_F satisfies GCC, or equivalent, if all geodesics of M enter $\operatorname{Int} \operatorname{supp} 1_F$.

Our interest is to study the problem of strong stabilisation when the GCC is not satisfied, more precisely, we will exhibit an example of strong stabilisation without GCC. Our starting point is the following unpublished result due to G. Lebeau.

Theorem 1.4 (Lebeau, unpublished)**.** *Let $a(x) = 1_{\mathbb{S}^d_+}(x)$ be the indicator function of the upper hemisphere, then (DW) has the strong stabilisation property.*

We will first give a simple proof of this theorem which relies on the (exact) spectral distribution of spherical Laplacians, and symmetries of spherical harmonics. Then we extend this result naturally to Zoll's surfaces of revolution, that is, Zoll's manifolds of dimension 2, on which the group $\mathbb{S}^1$ acts smoothly, faithfully, and isometrically.

Definition 1.5. A Riemannian manifold M is of type Zoll (or a Zoll's manifold), if all its geodesics are closed and share the same period (that is, length). For example, $M = \mathbb{S}^d$ are Zoll's manifolds.

The spectrum of Laplacian of a Zoll's manifold is very much alike that of spherical Laplacians, recalling that the spectrum of the spherical Laplacian on $\mathbb{S}^d$ is $\mathrm{Spec}(-\Delta_d) = \{(n + \frac{d-1}{2})^2 - \frac{(d-1)^2}{4} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Indeed, they satisfy the following spectral property ([Bes] Theorem 8.9 (J. Duistermaat and V. Guillemin)).

Proposition 1.6. *A Zoll's manifold must satisfy the spectral property that for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A > 0$,*

$$\mathrm{Spec}(-\Delta) \subset \bigcup_{\mathbb{N} \ni n \geq 1} I_n, \text{ with } I_n = ((n + \beta/4)^2 - A, (n + \beta/4)^2 + A). \tag{1.5}$$

In particular when $M = \mathbb{S}^d$, we simple let $\beta/4 = (d-1)/2$, and A be strictly larger than $(d-1)^2/4$ (see Lemma 1.9).

What we lack however, is enough symmetry about the Laplacian eigenfunctions of general Zoll's manifolds, so as to conclude easily as in the proof of Theorem 1.4; that is why we restrict ourselves to Zoll's surfaces of revolution. Surfaces of such type is automatically diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{S}^2$, and there exists exactly two points, called poles, say N and S that are invariant under the action of $\mathbb{S}^1$ ([Bes] 4.3). Thus we can parametrize the surfaces by coordinates (l, φ) where l is the arclength parameter of a (consequently every) geodesic from N to S, and φ is the rotational angle corresponding to the action of $\mathbb{S}^1$ ([Bes] 4.4), so that the Riemannian metric is of the form

$$g = \mathrm{d}l^2 + r(l)^2 \mathrm{d}\varphi^2 \tag{1.6}$$

([Bes] 4.5), where $r(l)$ is the distance from the point (l, φ) to the axis of rotation (see Figure 1.1). By [Bes] Lemma 4.9, there exists a unique l_0 such that $r(l)$ attains its maximum at $l = l_0$. Moreover we have $r'(l_0) = 0$, $r''(l_0) < 0$. The curve $\Gamma : l \equiv l_0$ defines a geodesic which we call the *equator*, while the regions $\Sigma^+ : l > l_0$ and $\Sigma^- : l < l_0$ will be called the *upper and lower hemi-surfaces* respectively. By a change of variable $r(l) = \sin\theta$, a Zoll's surface of revolution could be obtained by giving a Riemannian metric on $\mathbb{S}^2$, parametrized by (θ, φ), where θ is the latitude while φ is the longitude (of $\mathbb{S}^2$). By [Bes] Corollary 4.16, $(\mathbb{S}^2, g)$ is a Zoll's surface of revolution if and only if

$$g = (1 + h(\cos\theta))^2 \mathrm{d}\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta \mathrm{d}\varphi^2, \tag{1.7}$$

for some smooth odd function h from $[-1, 1]$ to $(-1, 1)$ with $h(1) = h(-1) = 0$. Now we can state the main result of this article.

Theorem 1.7. *Let Σ be a Zoll's surface of revolution, and let $a = 1_{\Sigma^+}$ be the indicator function of the upper hemi-surface. Then (DW) has the strong stablisation property.*



Figure 1.1: Zoll's Surface of Revolution, side view

Remark 1.8. There is a natural relaxation of the condition on the function a. It suffices that in a half-neighbourhood of the equator, say $0 < l - l_0 < \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, a be bounded from below by a positive constant and invariant by the rotation. No other restrictions for a are needed outside this neighbourhood. We won't prove it here, but only give some illustrations for the special cases on spheres to explain how this works. See Remark 1.12.

Acknowledgement This article which started as as the mémoire of Master 2 of University Paris-Sud, is finished under the guidance of Nicolas Burq, to whom the author owes great gratitude. The author would also express gratefulness to Gilles Lebeau, who gave originally the proof of the spherical cases, based on which this article is only possible.

1.2 Stabilisation of Damped Waves on $\mathbb{S}^d$

In this section we prove Theorem 1.4 as an explication of the strategy of the proof of Theorem 1.7.

First we recall some results concerning the spherical Laplacian and the spherical harmonics (see [S-W] Chapter IV, Section 2).

Lemma 1.9. *Let Δ_d denote the spherical Laplacian on $\mathbb{S}^d$, then*

1. $\mathrm{Spec}(-\Delta_d) = \left\{\lambda_n^2 = n(n+d-1) = (n + \frac{d-1}{2})^2 - \frac{(d-1)^2}{4} : n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$.

2. *For any eigenvalue λ_n, the associated eigenspace E_n consists of the restrictions to $\mathbb{S}^d$ the harmonic polynomials of $d+1$ variables, homogeneous of degree n. They are called the spherical harmonics of degree n. In particular, if $u \in E_n$, then $u(-x) = (-1)^n u(x)$.*

It is classic that the strong stabilisation of damped waves (on any manifold) are equivalent to the observability of undamped waves (see Proposition 2.5), that is, it suffices to show that there exists some constants $T, C > 0$ such that for every solution u of the undamped wave equation,

$$(\mathrm{W}) \begin{cases} \left(\partial_t^2 - \Delta\right) u = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{D}'\left(\mathbb{R} \times M\right), \\ (u, \partial_t u)_{t=0} = (u_0, u_1) & \in H^1\left(M\right) \times L^2\left(M\right), \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

the observability inequality holds,

$$E(u,0) = \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|u_1\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \int_0^T \int_M a(x) \left|\partial_t u(t,x)\right|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t. \tag{1.9}$$

We come back to $\mathbb{S}^d$. We aim to replace $-\Delta_d$ with $\mathcal{L} := -\Delta_d + \frac{(d-1)^2}{4}$ in view that

$$\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{L}) = \left\{ \left(n + \frac{d-1}{2}\right)^2 : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}. \tag{1.10}$$

And we consider the equation

$$(\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}}) \begin{cases} \left(\partial_t^2 + \mathcal{L}\right) u = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^d) \\ (u, \partial_t u)_{t=0} = (u_0, u_1) & \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^d) \times L^2(\mathbb{S}^d) \end{cases} \tag{1.11}$$

Lemma 1.10. *The observability of ($W_{\mathcal{L}}$) implies the observability of (W).*

Proof. Let u be any solution to (W). We decompose $u = v + w$ such that

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 + \mathcal{L})v = 0, & (v, \partial_t v)_{t=0} = (u_0, u_1); \\ (\partial_t^2 + \mathcal{L})w = \frac{(d-1)^2}{4} u, & (w, \partial_t w)_{t=0} = (0,0). \end{cases} \tag{1.12}$$

By the observability of ($\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$), for some $C > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} E(u,0) = E(v,0) &\leq C \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{S}^d} a|\partial_t v|^2 \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t \\ &\leq 2C \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{S}^d} a|\partial_t u|^2 \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t + 2C \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{S}^d} a|\partial_t w|^2 \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned} \tag{1.13}$$

By Duhamel's formula,

$$\partial_t w(t) = \int_0^t \cos((t-s)\sqrt{-\Delta_d}) \left(\tfrac{(d-1)^2}{4} u(s) \right) \mathrm{d}s \tag{1.14}$$

$$\|\partial_t w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(T) \int_0^T \|u(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \mathrm{d}s \leq C(T)' \|u_0, u_1\|_{L^2 \times H^{-1}}^2 \tag{1.15}$$

Combine the inequalities above, we obtain a weak observability,

$$E(u,0) \leq C \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{S}^d} a|\partial_t u|^2 \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t + C(T)' \|u_0, u_1\|_{L^2 \times H^{-1}}^2. \tag{1.16}$$

Then it is a classical method of compactness-uniqueness which kills the compact term $\|u_0, u_1\|_{L^2 \times H^{-1}}^2$ to obtain the (strong) observability (For more details, see the proof of Lemma 2.7). □

In order to prove the observability of ($\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$), we solve the equation explicitly. Write $u_0 = \sum_{n\geq 0} u_n^0,\ u_1 = \sum_{n\geq 0} u_n^1$, with $u_n^i \in E_n$ are spherical harmonics, then

$$u(t,x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{n\geq 0} \left(e^{it(n+\frac{d-1}{2})}u_n^+(x) + e^{-it(n+\frac{d-1}{2})}u_n^-(x)\right), & d\geq 2 \\ u_0^0 + u_0^1 t + \sum_{n\geq 1}\left(e^{it(n+\frac{d-1}{2})}u_n^+(x) + e^{-it(n+\frac{d-1}{2})}u_n^-(x)\right), & d=1 \end{cases} \tag{1.17}$$

where for $n\geq 0$ when $d\geq 2$ and $n\geq 1$ when $d=1$,

$$u_n^+ + u_n^- = u_n^0,\ i(n+\tfrac{d-1}{2})(u_n^+ - u_n^-) = u_n^1. \tag{1.18}$$

Lemma 1.11. *The observability of the spherical harmonics implies the observability of (W), that is, to prove the observability of (W), it suffices to show that for some $C>0$, and all spherical harmonics $v\in E_n$, for some $n\in\mathbb{N}$.*

$$\|av\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^d)} \geq C\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^d)} \tag{1.19}$$

Proof. Let $T=2\pi$. If $d\geq 2$, then By Fubini's theorem and the orthogonality of the family $\{e^{\pm it(n+\frac{d-1}{2})}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $L^2([0,2\pi])$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} a|\partial_t u|^2 \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t &= \int_0^{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} a(x)|\sum_{n\geq 0}\left(e^{it(n+\frac{d-1}{2})}u_n^+(x) + e^{-it(n+\frac{d-1}{2})}u_n^-(x)\right)|^2 \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} a(x)\sum_{n\geq 0}\left(|u_n^+(x)|^2 + |u_n^-(x)|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq C'\int_{\mathbb{S}^1}\sum_{n\geq 0}\left(|u_n^+(x)|^2 + |u_n^-(x)|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq 2C'E(u,0). \end{aligned} \tag{1.20}$$

If $d=1$, the proof is exactly the same, only this time we use the orthogonality of the family $\{e^{itn}\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ in $L^2([0,2\pi])$. □

Now that the symmetry of spherical harmonics stated in Lemma 1.9 implies their observability. Indeed, if $v\in E_n$, then

$$\|av\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^d)} = \|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^d_+)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^d)}, \tag{1.21}$$

the conclusion of Theorem 1.4 follows.

Remark 1.12. If $a(x) = 1_{0<x_{d+1}<\varepsilon}(x)$ is only an indicator function of a band, we still have strong stabilisation. Indeed, it suffices to first establish the observability of spherical harmonics over the region $-\varepsilon < x_{d+1} < \varepsilon$, which satisfies GCC, and then invoke as above the symmetry property. The observability over a domain satisfying GCC is true as a classical result. One may prove this either by applying Theorem 1.1 and the observability inequality (1.9) for the undamped wave $u(t) = \frac{\sin(t\sqrt{-\Delta_d})}{\sqrt{-\Delta_d}}v$ with v being any spherical harmonic, or by a direct application of Proposition 3.10, appealing to the propagation property of semiclassical measures.

1.3 Strategy for Proving Theorem 1.7

We see that the proof of Theorem 1.4 consists of 4 steps.

Step 1. The strong stabilisation of damped waves (DW) is equivalent to the observability of undamped waves (W), which is a classical result, see Proposition 2.5.

Step 2. Show that the observability of $(\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}})$ implies the observability of (W), where

$$(\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}}) \begin{cases} \left(\partial_t^2 + \mathcal{L}\right) u = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{D}'\left(\mathbb{R} \times M\right), \\ (u, \partial_t u)_{t=0} = (u_0, u_1) & \in H^1\left(M\right) \times L^2\left(M\right). \end{cases} \tag{1.22}$$

Here in this case $M = \mathbb{S}^d$ and $\mathcal{L} = -\Delta + \frac{(d-1)^2}{4}$. The constant $\frac{(d-1)^2}{4}$ is so chosen that the spectral of $\mathcal{L}$ satisfies (1.10). The observability of $(\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}})$ reads, for all its solution u,

$$E(u,0) = \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|u_1\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \int_0^T \int_M a(x) \left|\partial_t u(t,x)\right|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{1.23}$$

Step 3. Solve $(\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}})$ explicitly using Fourier series. Use orthogonality of the factors $\{e^{it(n+\frac{d-1}{2})}\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ and Fubini's theorem to reduce the observability of $(\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}})$ to the observability of spherical harmonics $v \in E_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (Lemma 1.11).

Step 4. Use symmetry properties of spherical harmonics (Lemma 1.9) to prove their observability, and conclude.

We intend to follow this strategy to prove Theorem 1.7, but with the following modifications.

In Step 2, we still prove that the observability of $(\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}})$ implies the observability of (W), only this time $M = \Sigma$ is a Zoll's surface of revolution, and the operator $\mathcal{L}$ should be defined by $L = -\Delta + K$ as a perturbation of $-\Delta$ where K is any bounded operator on $L^2(\Sigma)$. Then we fix K in the way that

$$\operatorname{Spec}\mathcal{L} \subset \left\{(n+\beta/4)^2 : \mathbb{N} \ni n \geq 1\right\}. \tag{1.24}$$

This is done by choosing $\mathcal{L}$ such that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficient large,

$$\mathcal{L}|_{\tilde{E}_n} = (n+\beta/4)\operatorname{Id}_{\tilde{E}_n}, \tag{1.25}$$

where $\tilde{E}_n = \operatorname{span}\{u \in C^\infty(\Sigma) : -\Delta u = \lambda^2 u, \text{ with } \lambda^2 \in I_n = ((n+\beta/4)^2 - A, (n+\beta/4)^2 + A)\}$ is the span of the eigenfunctions of $-\Delta$ to the eigenvalues in I_n.

In Step 3, we will use Ingham's inequality instead of orthogonality to reduce the observability of $(\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}})$ to the observability of $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions, even though for our case, $\beta = 2$ ([Bes] Proposition 4.35), therefore $\{e^{it(n+\beta/4)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} = \{e^{it(n+1/2)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is indeed an orthogonal family in $L^2([0,2\pi])$.

Step 4 has to be significantly modified due to the following two facts. First, an $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunction is not a Laplacian eigenfunction. As a matter of fact, the former is a finite linear combination of those of the latter which belong to $\tilde{E}_n$ for some n, so that $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions are merely quasi-modes. Second, neither the $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions nor the Laplacian eigenfunctions share such strong symmetries as the spherical harmonics. Therefore the observability of $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions does not come cheaply as in the spherical case. However we are still able to prove this by exploiting the semiclassical (perturbated) Helmholtz equation (3.40) which is satisfied by $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions, that is why we will (sometimes) use the term "the observability of the Helmholtz equation".

Proposition 1.13. *The Helmholtz equation* (3.40) *has the observability with* $a = 1_{\Sigma^+}$. *That is for some* $C > 0$, *and* $0 < \hat{h} < \hat{h}_0$, *the solution* $u(\hat{h})$ *satisfies*

$$\|au(\hat{h})\|_{L^2(\Sigma)} = \|u(\hat{h})\|_{L^2(\Sigma^+)} \geq C\|u(\hat{h})\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}. \tag{1.26}$$

This proposition is the only non-routine result, and is the main difficulty and the main effort of this article. To prove this, we will argue by contradiction and appeal to semiclassical defect measures, and extract a sequence of $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions who concentrate semiclassically on the equator. We then use the rotational invariance of the surface to separate the $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions in longitude

and latitude variables, and thus reduce the question to the observability of a 1-D Schrödinger equation, which is well approximated by the (classical and semiclassical) harmonic oscillator (under some proper rescalings), due to the undegeneracy of the geometry $r = r(l)$ at the equator $l = l_0$, that is $r''(l_0) < 0$. This will be done from Section 3.5 to Section 3.9. For a more detailed outline, see Section 3.1.

We must stress that *the results and arguments in Sections 2, 3.5 and 3.7 are classical, and we keep them here simply for the sake of self-containedness.*

2 Stabilisation and Observability

This section is merely aimed to recall some classical results, for example the well-posedness of damped wave equations and characterizations of weak and strong stabilisations.

2.1 Damped Wave Equation

By Hille-Yosida's theorem, we have

Theorem 2.1. *Let $0 \leq a \in L^\infty(M)$, and $(u_0, u_1) \in H^1(M) \times L^2(M)$, then (DW) admits a unique solution $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, L^2(M)) \cap C^0(\mathbb{R}, H^1(M))$. The following identity of energy decay holds, for all $T \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$E(u,T) = E(u,0) - \int_0^T \int_M a(x)|\partial_t u(t,x)|^2 \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{2.1}$$

Using the same proof, we have

Corollary 2.2. *Let K be a bounded operator on $L^2(M)$, and let $\mathcal{L} = -\Delta + K$. Then for $(u_0, u_1) \in H^1(M) \times L^2(M)$, $(W_\mathcal{L})$ admits a unique solution $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, L^2(M)) \cap C^0(\mathbb{R}, H^1(M))$.*

In order to deal with the problem caused by the existence of the constant eigenfunction to the eigenvalue zero for M has no boundary, we introduce the quotient Sobolev spaces

$$\mathcal{H}^s(M) = H^s(M)/\mathbb{C} = \{[u] = u + \mathbb{C} : u \in H^s(M)\}$$

equipped with the quotient norms. Notice the norm equivalence $\|[u]\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(M)} \simeq \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(M)}$. We have the following result, whose proof is a similar argument, using Hille-Yosida's theorem.

Corollary 2.3. *Define the Laplacian operator on the quotient space by $[\Delta][u] = [\Delta u]$ for $[u] \in D([\Delta]) = \{[u] \in \mathcal{H}^1(M) : \Delta u \in L^2(M)\}$. $[A] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -[\mathrm{Id}] \\ -j \circ [\Delta] & a \end{pmatrix}$ with $D([A]) = D([\Delta]) \times H^1(M)$ where $[\mathrm{Id}] : H^1(M) \to \mathcal{H}^1(M)$ is the projection, while $j : \mathcal{H}^0(M) \to L^2(M)$ associate each $[w] \in \mathcal{H}^0(M)$ a representative w such that $\int_M w\,\mathrm{d}x = 0$. Then for all $([u_0], u_1) \in \mathcal{H}^1(M) \times L^2(M)$, there exists a unique solution $([u], v) \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{H}^1) \times C^1(\mathbb{R}, L^2)$ of the equation*

$$(\mathrm{QW}) \begin{cases} \partial_t \binom{[u]}{v} + [A]\binom{[u]}{v} = 0, \\ \big([u], v\big)_{t=0} = \big([u_0], u_1\big). \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Moreover, if u is the solution of (DW) with initial data (u_0, u_1), then $([u], \partial_t u)$ is the solution of (QW).

2.2 Stabilisation and Observability Inequality

Definition 2.4. We say that (DW) has the weak stabilisation property if every solution u satisfies

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} E(u,t) = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

It has the strong stabilisation property if the limit behaviour of (2.3) is uniform for all u, that is, there exists a function $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ with $\lim_{t\to+\infty} f(t) = 0$ such that every solution u satisfies

$$E(u,t) \le E(u,0) \times f(t). \tag{2.4}$$

J.-L. Lions was the first to relate the observability to the strong stabilisation property, as is in the following proposition, see [B-G].

Proposition 2.5. *The following three statements are equivalent.*

1. *(DW) has the strong stabilisation property.*
2. *There exist $C, \beta > 0$ such that for all $t \ge 0$, and every solution u of (DW),*
$$E(u,t) \le Ce^{-\beta t}E(u,0). \tag{2.5}$$
3. *For some $T > 0$, $C > 0$, the observability inequality holds for every solution u of the undamped wave equation (W),*
$$E(u,0) \le C\int_0^T \int_M a|\partial_t u|^2 \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{2.6}$$

As for the weak stabilisation, we have the following characterisation.

Proposition 2.6. *If $0 \le \operatorname{supp} a \not\equiv 0$, then (DW) has the weak stabilisation property.*

Proof. The idea of the proof of the following proposition comes also from [B-G]. By a density argument, it suffices to suppose that $(u_0, u_1) \in D(A)$, so $([u_0], u_1) \in D([A])$. Let u denote the corresponding solution. Observe that $E(u,t) = \frac{1}{2}\|[u], \partial_t u\|^2_{\mathcal{H}}$ is non-increasing,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|[u], \partial_t u\right\|_{[A]} &:= \left\|\begin{pmatrix}[u]\\ \partial_t u\end{pmatrix}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \left\|[A]\begin{pmatrix}[u]\\ \partial_t u\end{pmatrix}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\le \left\|\begin{pmatrix}[u_0]\\ u_1\end{pmatrix}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \left\|A\begin{pmatrix}[u_0]\\ u_1\end{pmatrix}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty.\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

We claim that $(D([A]), \|\cdot\|_{[A]}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is compact. Indeed, if $\binom{[u]_n}{v_n}$ is bounded in $D([A])$, then $u_n, \Delta u_n, v_n, \nabla v_n$ are bounded in $L^2(M)$. Up to the extraction of a subsequence, $u_n - \int_M u_n \to u_0$ in H^1, so $[u_n] \to [u_0]$ in $\mathcal{H}^1(M)$, and $v_n \to v_0$ in $L^2(M)$. By (2.7), there exists a sequence $t_k \to +\infty$ such that $([u(t_k)], \partial_t u(t_k)) \rightharpoonup ([v_0], w_0)$ weakly in $D([A])$. Then by compactness, this convergence is of strong sense in $\mathcal{H}^1(M)$. Let v be the solution to (DW) with the initial data (v_0, v_1), where v_0 is a representative of $[v_0]$ such that $\int_M v_0 \mathrm{d}x = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}E(v,t) &= \left\|\begin{pmatrix}[v(t)]\\ \partial_t v\end{pmatrix}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \left\|e^{-t[A]}\begin{pmatrix}[v_0]\\ v_1\end{pmatrix}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \left\|e^{-t[A]}\lim_{k\to\infty} e^{-t_k[A]}\begin{pmatrix}[u_0]\\ u_1\end{pmatrix}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \left\|\lim_{k\to\infty} e^{-(t+t_k)[A]}\begin{pmatrix}[u_0]\\ u_1\end{pmatrix}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \left\|\begin{pmatrix}[v_0]\\ v_1\end{pmatrix}\right\|_{\mathcal{H}} = E(v,0).\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

So v satisfies the undamped wave equation as well.

Let $(e_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a complete set of orthonormal eigenfunctions of $-\Delta$ such that $-\Delta e_m = \lambda_m^2 e_m$ and λ_m increases with m. Decompose the initial data,

$$v_0 = \sum_{m\geq 1} \alpha_m e_m = \sum_{n\geq 1} v_n^0, \quad v_1 = \sum_{m\geq 0} \beta_m e_m = \sum_{n\geq 0} v_n^1$$

where the terms v_n^0 and v_n^1 are finite sums of some terms $\alpha_m e_m$ and $\beta_m e_m$, of the same eigenvalue, respectively, so that v_n^0 and v_n^1 are eigenfunctions to $-\Delta$ of the eigenvalue $\lambda_n'^2$, such that $\lambda_i' \neq \lambda_j'$ as long as $i \neq j$. Then we write down the solution explicitly,

$$v(t) = \beta_0 t + \sum_{n\geq 1} \left(e^{it\lambda_n'} v_n^+ + e^{-it\lambda_n'} v_n^-\right) \tag{2.9}$$

with

$$v_n^+ + v_n^- = v_n^0, \quad i\lambda_n'(v_n^+ - v_n^-) = v_n^1. \tag{2.10}$$

Now fix $n_0 \geq 1$, and set $w_{n_0}(T,x) = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \partial_t v(t,x) e^{-it\lambda_{n_0}'} \mathrm{d}t$. The fact that $a\partial_t v = 0$ implies $a w_{n_0} = 0$. An explicit calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} w_{n_0}(T,x) = i\lambda_{n_0}' v_{n_0}^+ &+ \sum_{n\neq n_0} \frac{i\lambda_n'}{iT(\lambda_n' - \lambda_{n_0}')}\left(e^{iT(\lambda_n' - \lambda_{n_0}')} - 1\right) v_n^+ \\ &- \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{i\lambda_n'}{iT(\lambda_n' + \lambda_{n_0}')}\left(e^{-iT(\lambda_n' + \lambda_{n_0}')} - 1\right) v_n^-. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

This implies, as $T\to\infty$, $w_{n_0}(T,x) \to i\lambda_{n_0}' v_{n_0}^+$ in $L^2(M)$. Since $a w_{n_0} = 0$ and $\lambda_{n_0}' > 0$, one must have $a v_{n_0}^+ = 0$. Therefore $v_{n_0}^+ = 0$ since the nodal set $\{v_{n_0}^+ = 0\}$ is of measure zero. The same argument shows $v_{n_0}^- = 0$ for $n_0 \geq 1$. By the same reason, let $w_0(T,x) = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \partial_t v(t,x)\mathrm{d}t = \beta_0$, then $0 = a w_0 = a\beta_0$, $\beta_0 = 0$. Hence $v \equiv 0$, $E(u,t_k) \to E(v,0) = 0$. □

Next we are going to induce the observability of (W) from that of ($\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$) for any bounded operator K on $L^2(M)$, even though it will be properly chosen later.

Lemma 2.7. *The observability of ($\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$) implies the observability of (W).*

Proof. Write $\mathcal{L} = -\Delta + K$. Let u be the associated solution to (W). Decompose $u = w + v$ with

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 + \mathcal{L})v = 0, & (v, \partial_t v)_{t=0} = (u_0, u_1); \\ (\partial_t^2 + \mathcal{L})w = Ku, & (w, \partial_t w)_{t=0} = (0,0). \end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

By the observability of ($\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$), for some $C > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} E(u,0) = E(v,0) &\leq C\int_0^T \int_M a|\partial_t v|^2 \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\leq 2C\int_0^T \int_M a|\partial_t u|^2 \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + 2C\int_0^T \int_M a|\partial_t w|^2 \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

By Duhamel's formula,

$$\partial_t w(t) = \int_0^t \cos((t-s)\sqrt{\mathcal{L}})Ku(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \tag{2.14}$$

$$\|\partial_t w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(T)\int_0^T \|u(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \mathrm{d}s \leq C(T)'\|u_0,u_1\|_{L^2\times H^{-1}}^2 \tag{2.15}$$

Combine (2.13) and (2.15),

$$E(u,0) \leq C\int_0^T\int_M a|\partial_t u|^2 \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + C(T)'\|u_0,u_1\|_{L^2\times H^{-1}}^2. \tag{2.16}$$

In particular, if we assume $\int_M u_0 \mathrm{d}x = 0$ by subtracting from u_0 its mean value $\frac{1}{|M|}\int_M u_0\,\mathrm{d}x$, then (2.16) becomes

$$\|[u_0],u_1\|_{\mathcal{H}^1\times L^2}^2 = 2E(u,0) \leq C\int_0^T\int_M a|\partial_t u|^2 \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + C\|[u_0],u_1\|_{\mathcal{L}^2\times H^{-1}}^2. \tag{2.17}$$

To kill the term $\|u_0,u_1\|_{\mathcal{L}^2\times H^{-1}}$ which is compact with respect to the $\mathcal{H}^1\times L^2$ norm, and obtain the desired observability, we argue by contradiction. Supposing that the observability of (W) does not hold, then there exists a sequence of initial data $([u_0^n],u_1^n)\in\mathcal{H}^1(M)\times L^2(M)$ such that,

$$E(u^n,0) = \frac{1}{2}\|[u_0^n],u_1^n\|_{\mathcal{H}^1\times L^2}^2 = 1,\quad \int_0^n\int_M a|\partial_t u^n|^2\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = o(1). \tag{2.18}$$

where $u^n(t)$ are corresponding solutions to (W). By Rellich's compact injections, up to the extraction of a subsequence, one may assume that

$$([u_0^n],u_1^n) \rightharpoonup ([u_0],u_1) \text{ weakly in } \mathcal{H}^1(M)\times L^2(M), \tag{2.19}$$

$$([u_0^n],u_1^n) \to ([u_0],u_1) \text{ strongly in } \mathcal{H}^0(M)\times H^{-1}(M) \tag{2.20}$$

for some $([u_0],u_1)\in\mathcal{H}^1\times L^2$. Passing $n\to\infty$ in (2.16),

$$1 = E(u^n,0) \leq o(1) + \|[u_0^n],u_1^n\|_{\mathcal{L}^2\times H^{-1}}^2 \to \|[u_0],u_1\|_{\mathcal{L}^2\times H^{-1}}^2. \tag{2.21}$$

Therefore, we get a contradiction by the following Lemma 2.8. □

Lemma 2.8. *Let $([u_0^n],u_1^n)\in\mathcal{H}^1(M)\times L^2(M)$ be a sequence of initial data and let $([u^n],\partial_t u^n)$ be the corresponding solutions to (QW) with no damping, i.e. $[A] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -[\mathrm{Id}] \\ -j\circ[\Delta] & 0\end{pmatrix}$, such that*

1. *$([u_0^n],u_1^n)$ is bounded in $\mathcal{H}^1(M)\times L^2(M)$.*
2. *$([u_0^n],u_1^n) \rightharpoonup ([u_0],u_1)$ weakly in $\mathcal{H}^1(M)\times L^2(M)$.*
3. *for all $T>0$, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_0^T\int_M a|\partial_t u^n|^2\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = 0$.*

Then $([u_0],u_1) = (0,0)$.

Proof. Choose representatives u_0^n of $[u_0^n]$ such that $\int_M u_0^n \mathrm{d}x = 0$. Let u^n be solutions of (W) with the initial data (u_0^n,u_0^1). Then $E(u^n,t) = E(u^n,0) = \frac{1}{2}\|[u_0^n],u_1^n\|_{\mathcal{H}^1\times L^2}^2$ is bounded uniformly in t and n, therefore $[u^n]$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R},\mathcal{H}^1(M))$ and $\partial_t u^n$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R},L^2(M))$. Moreover $\int_M u^n(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}x$ is bounded in $L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_t)$ (and is of order $O(t)$), consequently u^n is bounded in $L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R},H^1(M))$. Ascoli's theorem and compact injection theorems show that, up to the extraction of a subsequence, there exists a $(u,v)\in C^0(\mathbb{R},L^2)\times L^\infty(\mathbb{R},L^2(M))$ such that

1. $u^n\to u$ strongly in $L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R},L^2(M))$

2. $u^n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly with respect to the weak-$*$ topology of $L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, H^1(M))$.

3. $\partial_t u^n \rightharpoonup v$ with respect to the weak-$*$ topology of $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, L^2(M))$.

Pass to the limit in the sense of distribution, (u, v) satisfies the wave equation (W), in particular $v = \partial_t u$ in $\mathcal{D}'(M)$. By the equation (W), $\partial_t(\partial_t u^n) = \Delta u^n$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, H^{-1}(M))$, so $\partial_t u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, H^{-1}(M))$. $u \in C(\mathbb{R}, L^2(M)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}, H^{-1}(M))$ is the solution of the undamped linear wave equation with initial data (u_0, u_1). However, since $(u_0, u_1) \in H^1(M) \times L^2(M)$, there exists a solution in the $C(\mathbb{R}, H^1(M)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}, L^2(M))$. By the uniqueness of the solution in $C(\mathbb{R}, L^2(M)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}, H^{-1}(M))$, these two solutions must coincide. Therefore, it is legitimate to talk about the energy of u, which is conserved, $E(u, t) \equiv E(u, 0)$. On the other hand, since $a\partial_t u = 0$ in $\mathcal{D}'(M)$, u should also satisfy the damped wave equation (DW). The weak stability result (Proposition 2.6) shows that the energy $E(u, t)$ must decay to zero as $t \to +\infty$. Hence $E(u, 0) = 0$, i.e. $([u_0], u_1) = (0, 0)$. □

Remark 2.9. We have shown that the observability of (W_K) within time T implies the observability of (W) within time T' for some T' of which we have no idea how large it is. But a different argument is possible to restraint T' in the open interval $(T, T + \varepsilon)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. See [B-G].

3 Stabilisation on Zoll's Surfaces of Revolution

3.1 Outline of the Proof of Theorem 1.7

Section 3.4 uses the spectral property of the Laplacian Beltrami operator on (general) Zoll's manifolds, and Ingham's inequality to reduce the observability of $(\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}})$ to that of the $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions who satisfy a semiclassical Helmholtz equation, where the operator $\mathcal{L}$ is defined by chosen the perturbation K smartly so that (1.24) is satisfied.

However the observability of the $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions is far from being as straightforward as that of the spherical harmonics, knowing at least that they do not seem to have enough symmetries. So we argue by contradiction (and fix a pure sequence of $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions of which the observability won't hold) and appeal to the semiclassical defect measure. Since the geometric control condition is not satisfied, we obtain the semiclassical concentration behaviour of this sequence (Section 3.5).

Section 3.6 reduces the observability of the sequence chosen above to that of a 1-D Schrödinger equation. Indeed, by Proposition 3.2, for $\hat{h} = (n + 1/2)^{-1}$, $u(\hat{h})$ could be decomposed as in (3.43). In this formula (x, φ) is an isothermal coordinate, and $w_{\lambda,k}$ are eigenfunctions of the semiclassical Schrödinger operator (3.47), with the energy $E = 1 - \lambda^{-2}k^2$. Lemma 3.13 and the discussion below it show that we may only consider those terms which satisfies $\hat{E} := 1 - \hat{h}^2k^2 = o(1)$ as $\hat{h} \to 0$. We regroup the decomposition, and obtain (3.54), where each $w_{\hat{h},k}$ is defined by summing up those $w_{\lambda,k}$ with the same k, and it satisfies the equation (3.57). Then we use the orthogonality of the factor $\{e^{ik\varphi}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ on $L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)$ and Fubini's theorem, to reduce the observability of $u(\hat{h})$ to the observability of each $w_{\hat{h},k}$ (Lemma 3.14). For this purpose, we again argue by contradiction and extract a subsequence of $\{w_{\hat{h},k} : k = k(\hat{h})\}_{\hat{h}\to 0}$, such that the observability does not hold for it. Then by a further extraction, we assume either $\hat{E} = O(\hat{h})$, or $\hat{E} \gg \hat{h}$, which will be treated by Section 3.8 and Section 3.9 separately.

When $\hat{E} = O(\hat{h})$, Corollary 3.27 shows that, for $\hat{h}$ sufficiently small, and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists at most one $\lambda > 0$ such that $w_{\lambda,k}$ appeared as an additive factor of $w_{\hat{h},k}$. Therefore $w_{\hat{h},k} = w_{\lambda,k}$ is an eigenfunction of a semiclassical Schrödinger operator $-h^2\partial_x^2 + V$, to an eigenvalue $O(h)$. By a proper scaling, and a further extraction, $w_{\lambda,k}$ are eigenfunctions of a classical Schrödinger operator $-\partial_z^2 + V_{\hat{h}}$ (where $V_{\hat{h}}$ is well approximated by z^2), with eigenvalues being $F_0 + o(1) = 2i_0 + 1 + o(1)$

for some $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Simultaneously we deduce that $w_{\lambda,k} = v_{i_0} + o(1)_{L^2}$, where v_{i_0} is the eigenfunction of the classical harmonic oscillator $-\partial_z^2 + z^2$, to the eigenvalue $F_0 = 2i_0 + 1$. Consequently $w_{\lambda,k}$ should satisfies the observability, since v_{i_0} is either an even function or an odd function.

When $\hat{E} \gg \hat{h}$, we use another scaling, showing that $w_{\hat{h},k}$ is an approximate eigenfunction of a semiclassical Schrödinger operator with the semiclassical parameter $\tilde{h} = \hat{h}/\hat{E} = o(1)$ (see (3.100)). An inhomogeneous Agmon estimate shows that for a proper truncation χ, $\|\chi w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2} = 1 + o(\hat{h})$, where $\chi w_{\hat{h},k}$ is again an approximated eigenfunction of a semiclassical Schrödinger operator (see (3.104)), which is well approximated by a semiclassical harmonic oscillator. Appealing to the propagation property of the semiclassical defect measure, the observability of $w_{\hat{h},k}$ follows by a routine argument by contradiction.

3.2 Preliminary 1: Geometry of Zoll's Surfaces of Revolution

In this section, we consider Zoll's surfaces of revolution. They are automatically diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{S}^2$ (see [Bes] 4.3).

A 2-dimensional Riemannian manifold Σ is called a surface of revolution if $\mathbb{S}^1 \simeq SO(2)$ acts faithfully and isometrically on Σ. If $\Sigma \simeq \mathbb{S}^2$, which is especially our case, then there are exactly two fixed points, which are called the North and South poles, denoted by N and S respectively. Fix a geodesic γ_0 from N to S, parametrized by arc length. We assume that the length $|\gamma_0| = \pi$. Then for all $\varphi \in S^1$, $\gamma_\varphi = \varphi\gamma_0$ are geodesics joining N and S, which are called the meridians. The coordinates on $U = \Sigma\backslash\{N, S\}$ is given by $\gamma_\varphi(l) \mapsto (l, \varphi) \in (0, \pi) \times S^1$. The coordinate patches near N and S are $U_N = \{N\} \cup \{(l, \varphi) : 0 \le l < \pi\}$, and $U_S = \{S\} \cup \{(l, \varphi) : 0 < l \le \pi\}$. They are diffeomorphic to the open ball $B(0, \pi)$ via the usual polar coordinates. The Riemannian metric on U has the form

$$g = \mathrm{d}l^2 + r(l)^2 \mathrm{d}\varphi^2. \tag{3.1}$$

The Laplacian operator is

$$\Delta = \partial_l^2 + \frac{r'(l)}{r(l)}\partial_l + \frac{1}{r(l)^2}\partial_\varphi^2. \tag{3.2}$$

There is a well defined differential operator D_φ on Σ. It is the differential operator with respect to the the vector fields X on Σ defined as follows: On each point $m \in \Sigma\backslash\{N, S\}$, we associate the unit tangent vector $Y(m) \in T_m\Sigma$ which is tangent to the parallel that passes through m, i.e. $\varphi \mapsto \varphi m$, whose orientation is given by the positive orientation of S^1. Then let $X(m) = r(l)Y(m)$ if $m = (l, \varphi) \in U$, and let $X(N) = 0$, $X(S) = 0$. For $u \in C^\infty(M)$, define

$$D_\varphi u = \frac{1}{i}\langle \mathrm{d}u, X\rangle. \tag{3.3}$$

On U, we simply have $D_\varphi = \frac{1}{i}\partial_\varphi$, with ∂_φ being the usual differentiation with respect to φ. Therefore D_φ is symmetric and commutes with Δ,

$$[\Delta, D_\varphi] = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

The following proposition states the basic geometric properties of Zoll's surfaces of revolution, which will be used later. See [Bes] for reference.

Proposition 3.1. *Let Σ be a Zoll's surface of revolution, the lengths of whose geodesics are equal to 2π, then*

1. *$r : [0, \pi] \to [0, 1]$, $r(0) = r(\pi) = 0$, $r'(0) = 1$, $r'(\pi) = -1$, $r''(0) = r''(\pi) = 0$. There exists a unique $l_0 \in (0, \pi)$ such that $r(l_0) = 1$, furthermore, this l_0 satisfies $r'(l_0) = 0$, $r''(l_0) < 0$. The curve $\Gamma : l \equiv l_0$ is a geodesic which is called the equator.*

2. *Apart from the equator, every geodesic is contained between a pair of parallels $l = l'$ and $l = \pi - l'$, and that it contacts each of the parallel exactly once.*

From this proposition, every geodesic of Σ except for the equator Γ enters the upper hemi-surface $\Sigma^+ = \{l > l_0\}$. To simplify the calculation, we re-parametrize the meridians by a proper translation of the coordinate l, so that

$$r : [L, R] \to [0, 1], \quad L = -l_0, \ R = \pi - l_0. \tag{3.5}$$

Now $\Gamma = \{l = 0\}$, $\Sigma^+ = \{l > 0\}$. We can also find an isothermal coordinates on U by a change of coordinate $l = f(x)$, where the smooth function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by the following equation,

$$\begin{cases} f'(x) = r(f(x)) \\ f(0) = 0, \ f'(0) = 1. \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

To such an equation, the solution exists and is unique, and satisfies (see [Arn])

$$L < f(x) < R, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \ \ f(-\infty) = L, \ f(+\infty) = R. \tag{3.7}$$

Therefore f devines a diffeomorphism between $\mathbb{R}$ and (L, R). The coordinates (x, φ) is isothermal, indeed,

$$g = f'(x)^2 \mathrm{d}x^2 + r(f(x))^2 \mathrm{d}\varphi^2 = \rho(x)^2 (\mathrm{d}x^2 + \mathrm{d}\varphi^2), \tag{3.8}$$

where $\rho(x) := r(f(x)) = f'(x)$. ρ takes value in $(0, 1]$, and $\rho(x) < 1$ except for $x = 0$, where $\rho(0) = 1$, $\rho'(0) = 0$, $\rho''(0) < 0$. The Laplacian takes a simpler form under this isothermal coordinates,

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{\rho(x)^2} (\partial_x^2 + \partial_\varphi^2). \tag{3.9}$$

3.3 Preliminary 2: Laplacian Eigenfunctions on Surfaces of Revolution

Since $-\Delta$ commutes with D_φ, it is natural to have a basis of their common eigenfunctions. Indeed, this is true because $-\Delta$ and D_φ have compact resolvents which commute. The following proposition tells us that we may choose this basis to be separated in variables. The proof is inspired by [Bee].

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\Sigma \simeq \mathbb{S}^2$ be a surface of revolution, then on each Laplacian eigenspace E_{λ^2} for some $\lambda > 0$,*

1. *there exists an orthonormal basis $(e_{\lambda,k})_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of $L^2(\Sigma)$, which is formed by common eigenfunctions of $-\Delta$ and D_φ, such that*

$$-\Delta e_{\lambda,k} = \lambda^2 e_{\lambda,k}, \quad D_\varphi e_{\lambda,k} = k e_{\lambda,k}. \tag{3.10}$$

The number $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ is called the rotation number. *Under the coordinates (x, φ) of $U = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1$, they are of the form*

$$e_{\lambda,k}(x, \varphi) = w_{\lambda,k}(x) e^{ik\varphi}, \ k \in \mathbb{Z}; \tag{3.11}$$

2. *$w_{\lambda,k}$ satisfies the following equation*

$$-\partial_x^2 w_{\lambda,k} + k^2 w_{\lambda,k} = \lambda^2 \rho^2 w_{\lambda,k}, \tag{3.12}$$

with the boundary conditions $w_{\lambda,k}^{(n)}(\pm\infty) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ which are posed only for $k \neq 0$, so that $e_{\lambda,k}$ extends to a smooth function on Σ. Note that the solution spaces of these equations are of dimension one, so $w_{\lambda,k}$ are uniquely determined up to some multiplicative constant coefficients.

3. *We may fix those coefficients such that* $(e_{\lambda_1,k_1}, e_{\lambda_2,k_2})_{L^2(\Sigma)} = 2\pi\delta_{\lambda_1=\lambda_2,k_1=k_2}$. *And for fixed* k, $(w_{\lambda_1,k}, w_{\lambda_2,k})_{L^2_{\rho^2 \mathrm{d}x}} = \delta_{\lambda_1=\lambda_2}$.

Proof. The group action of $\mathbb{S}^1$ on M induces naturally a group action on function spaces by $\varphi f = f \circ \varphi^{-1}$. On a surface of revolution, $\mathbb{S}^1$ acts isometrically, so the group action commutes with the Laplacian, and that each E_{λ^2} is stable under $\mathbb{S}^1$. It is known that the irreducible complex representations of $\mathbb{S}^1$ are all one-dimensional of the form

$$\mathbb{S}^1 \to U(1) \quad \varphi \mapsto e^{ik\varphi}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{3.13}$$

By the decomposition of irreducible representations, there exist a basis of functions on E_{λ^2} consisting of those $e_{\lambda,k}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that

$$e_{\lambda,k}(x,\varphi) = \varphi^{-1} e_{\lambda,k}(x,0) = e^{-ik\varphi} e_{\lambda,k}(x,0).$$

This proves the first assertion. Since $-\Delta$ and D_φ are symmetric, $e_{\lambda,k}$ and $e_{\lambda',k'}$ must be orthogonal unless $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $k = k'$. The use of Fubini's theorem then proves the third assertion. Indeed,

$$0 = (w_{\lambda_1,k}(x)e^{ik\varphi}, w_{\lambda_2,k}(x)e^{ik\varphi})_{L^2(\Sigma)} = 2\pi (w_{\lambda_1,k}, w_{\lambda_2,k})_{L^2_{\rho^2 \mathrm{d}x}}. \tag{3.14}$$

As for the second assertion, the equation comes straightforwardly by plugging (3.11) into (3.10). The boundary condition is evident when $n = 0$. For arbitrary n, since $D^n_\varphi e_{\lambda,k} = k^n e_{\lambda,k}$, we are back at the $n = 0$ case. It is a classical result that the dimension of the solution spaces of the Schrödinger type equation (3.12) is one. Indeed, suppose w_1 and w_2 are two solutions, then the Wronskian $W(w_1, w_2)$, which is constant by a direct calculation, vanishes at infinity by the boundary conditions. So these two solutions are linearly dependent. □

3.4 First Reduction: Observability of Helmholtz Equation

The discussion of thie section works for Zoll's manifolds of arbitrary dimensions.

A Zoll's manifold must be compact, otherwise it could have geodesics arbitrarily long. Therefore, the spectra of $-\Delta$ is discrete. Let $\{e_m\}_m$ be the complete set of eigenfunctions of $-\Delta$. For any e_m, such that $-\Delta e_m = \lambda_m^2 e_m$, there exists a $1 \le n_m \in \mathbb{N}$ (which is unique when λ_m is sufficiently large) such that $\lambda_n^2 \in I_{n_m}$. Let

$$K e_m := \left[(n_m + \beta/4)^2 - \lambda_n^2\right] e_m, \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.15}$$

Then K defines a bounded operator since $|(n_m + \beta/4)^2 - \lambda_n^2| \le A$, whence $\|K\|_{L^2(M)\to L^2(M)} \le A$. And the operator defined by $\mathcal{L} := -\Delta + K$, satisfies (1.24). By Lemma 2.7, it suffices to prove the observability of the equation ($\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$). Write

$$u_0 = \sum_{n\ge 1} u_n^0, \ u_1 = \sum_{n\ge 1} u_n^1,$$

where $\mathcal{L} u_n^i = (n + \beta/4)^2 u_n^i$ for $i = 0, 1$ and $1 \le n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the solution u writes

$$u(t,x) = \sum_{n\ge 1} \left(e^{it(n+\beta/4)} u_n^+(x) + e^{-it(n+\beta/4)} u_n^-(x)\right), \tag{3.16}$$

where

$$u_n^+ + u_n^- = u_n^0, \ i(n + \beta/4)(u_n^+ - u_n^-) = u_n^1. \tag{3.17}$$

Recall the Ingham's inequality, see [Zua].

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\{\mu_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a sequence of real numbers such that*

$$\mu_{k+1}-\mu_k \geq \gamma > 0, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{3.18}$$

Then, for any $T > 2\pi/\gamma$, there exists a constant $C(T,\gamma) > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{C(T,\gamma)}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}|a_k|^2 \leq \int_0^T \Big|\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} a_k e^{i\mu_k t}\Big|^2 \mathrm{d}t \leq C(T,\gamma)\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}|a_k|^2, \tag{3.19}$$

for any sequence of complex numbers $\{a_k\}_k \in l^2(\mathbb{Z})$.

Let $\mu_k = \begin{cases} k+1+\beta/4, & k\geq 0, \\ -(-k+\beta/4), & k<0, \end{cases}$ and $a_k(x) = \begin{cases} u^+_{k+1}(x), & k\geq 0, \\ u^-_{-k}(x), & k<0, \end{cases}$ which is in $l^2(\mathbb{Z})$ for almost every $x \in M$. Apply Lemma 3.3 with $\gamma = 1$, and fix $T > 2\pi$, there exists $C(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T\int_M a|\partial_t u|^2 \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t &= \int_M\int_0^T a\Big|\sum_{n\geq 1}(n+\beta/4)(e^{it(n+\beta/4)}u_n^+ - e^{-it(n+\beta/4)}u_n^-)\Big|^2 \mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq C(T)\int_M a\sum_{n\geq 1}\big|(n+\beta/4)u_n^+|^2 + |(n+\beta/4)u_n^-\big|^2 \mathrm{d}x \\ &= \frac{1}{2}C(T)\sum_{n\geq 1}\int_M a\big((n+\beta/4)^2\big|u_n^0\big|^2 + \big|u_n^1\big|^2\big)\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

If the observability for the (perturbed) Helmholtz equation (Proposition 1.13) is true, then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T\int_M a|\partial_t u|^2 \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t &\geq \frac{1}{2}C(T)C(M,a)\sum_{n\geq 1}\int_M \big((n+\beta/4)^2|u_n^0|^2 + |u_n^1|^2\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq C(T)C'(M,a)E(u,0).\end{aligned}$$

Thus we reduced the observability of $(\mathrm{W}_{\mathcal{L}})$ to that of the Helmholtz equation.

Remark 3.4. If $\dim M = 2$, in particular for our case in Section 3, we do not need Ingham's inequality, because $\beta = 2$ as pointed out in the Introduction. Indeed, the family $\{e^{\pm it(n+1/2)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ forms an orthogonal basis on $L^2[0,2\pi]$.

3.5 Concentration of $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions

The arguments and results of this section is classical. For the reference of semiclassical defect measures, see [Bur-2] or [Zwo].

Let M be a Riemannian manifold, which needs not to be compact. We recall the following theorem.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose $u(h)$ $(0 < h < h_0)$ is a family of functions on M, indexed by h (could be either continuously or discretely indexed), bounded in $L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(M)$. Then there exists a sequence $h_n \to 0$ and a positive Radon measure μ on T^*M such that for all $b \in C_c^\infty(T^*M)$, and all $\chi \in C_c^\infty(M)$ which equals to 1 on $\pi(\operatorname{supp} b)$, then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\big(B(h_n)(\chi u(h_n)), \chi u(h_n)\big)_{L^2(M)} = \int_{T^*M} b(x,\xi)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(x,\xi), \tag{3.20}$$

where $B(h)$ is a semiclassical operator on M with its semiclassical principle symbol $\sigma(B) = b$. The measure μ is called a h-semiclassical defect measure of $u(h)$, to emphasize the importance of the scale h, or simply a semiclassical defect measure if there is no ambiguity of the scale h in the context.

Remark 3.6. The right hand side of (3.20) does not depend on the choice of χ, that is why μ is well defined. In particular, when M is compact, $\chi \equiv 1$ serves the purpose.

Remark 3.7. When there is no need to extract a subsequence h_n, we say $u(h)$ is pure, and we can talk about "the" semiclassical measure of $u(h)$.

We also need the following corollary which will be used in Section 3.9.

Corollary 3.8. *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.5, suppose $\{b_n\}_n$ and b are functions in $C_c^\infty(T^*M)$ such that $b_n \to b$ in $C_c^\infty(T^*M)$, and that $u(h_n)$ is pure. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \big(B_n(h_n)(\chi u(h_n)), \chi u(h_n)\big)_{L^2(M)} = \int_{T^*M} b(x,\xi)\,\mathrm{d}\mu,$$

where $\sigma(B_n) = b_n$.

This corollary is a simple consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.9. *For some $M > 0$ and every $a \in C_c^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$,*

$$\|a(x,hD)\|_{L^2\to L^2} \le C \sup_{|\alpha|\le Md} h^{|\alpha|/2} \|\partial_{x,\xi}^\alpha a\|_{L^\infty}.$$

In particular, $\|a(x,hD)\|_{L^2\to L^2} \le C\,\|a\|_{L^\infty} + O(h^{1/2})$.

As for the proof of the lemma, we refer to [Zwo] Theorem 5.1, which deals with the Weyl quantization, but the proof is exactly the same.

The idea of the proof of the following proposition comes from [Bur-1], and is originated by G. Lebeau. Some techniques of pseudodifferential calculus come from [Zwo] and [A-G].

Proposition 3.10. *Let $P(h) = -h^2\Delta - 1$ $(0 < h < h_0)$ be a semiclassical differential operator on a compact Riemannian manifold M without boundary. Suppose $u(h)$ satisfies $P(h)u(h) = o(h)_{L^2}$ and $\|u(h)\|_{L^2} = 1$.*

1. *If $0 \le a \in L^\infty(M)$ satisfies GCC, then $\|au(h)\|_{L^2} \ge \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$ and $0 < h < h_0$.*
2. *If $u(h)$ is pure, and $\|au(h)\|_{L^2} = o(1)$, then its semiclassical measure μ is supported in the union of those trajectories of the Hamiltonian flow induced by the principal symbol of $P(h)$ (which is, in this case, the geodesic flow), who lie in S^*M and do not enter the domain $T^*U(a)$.*

Proof. We argue by contradiction to prove the first statement. The second statement follows automatically from the proof. Suppose by contradiction that there exists a pure family $u(h_n)$ $(h_n \to 0)$ such that,

$$P(h_n)u(h_n) = o(h_n)_{L^2}, \quad \|u(h_n)\|_{L^2} = 1, \quad \|au(h_n)\|_{L^2} = o(1). \tag{3.21}$$

Let μ be the semiclassical defect measure of $u(h_n)$. Then for any $b \in C_c^\infty(T^*M)$,

$$\begin{aligned} o(1) &= \big(b(x,h_nD)P(h_n)u(h_n), u(h_n))\big)_{L^2} \\ &= \big((b(p-1))(x,h_nD)u(h_n), u(h_n)\big)_{L^2} + O(h_n) \\ &\to \int_{T^*M} b(x,\xi)(p(x,\xi)-1)\,\mathrm{d}\mu. \end{aligned}$$

where p is the semiclassical principle symbol of $-h^2\Delta$, written in local coordinates as

$$p(x,\xi)=\sum_{i,j}g^{ij}(x)\xi_i\xi_j. \tag{3.22}$$

Therefore,

$$\operatorname{supp}\mu\subset T^*M\cap\{p=1\}=S^*M. \tag{3.23}$$

Observing that $P(h)$ is self-adjointed, one has

$$\begin{aligned}o(1)&=ih_n^{-1}\big([b(x,h_nD),P(h_n)]u(h_n),u(h_n)\big)_{L^2}\\&=ih_n^{-1}\big([b(x,h_nD),-h_n^2\Delta]u(h_n),u(h_n)\big)_{L^2}\\&=\big(\{b,p\}(x,h_nD)u(h_n),u(h_n)\big)_{L^2}+o(h_n)_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

Passing $n\to\infty$,

$$0=(\mu,\{b,p\})=(\mu,-H_p(b)). \tag{3.24}$$

That is, μ satisfies the equation $H_p\mu=0$ in the distributional sense, or equivalently, μ is invariant by the Hamiltonian flow generated by p, which is the geodesic flow when restricted to S^*M if we identify $TM\simeq T^*M$ by $\eta\mapsto(\eta,\cdot)_g$. Therefore the projection $\pi(\operatorname{supp}\mu)$ on M is a union of geodesics. The assumption (3.21) implies that $u(h_n)\to 0$ strongly in $L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(U(a))$, hence $\operatorname{supp}\mu\cap T^*U(a)=\emptyset$, $\operatorname{supp}\mu$ is a union of geodesics (actually the trajectories of the geodesic flow) who do not intersect with $T^*U(a)$, forcing $\operatorname{supp}\mu=\emptyset$, $\mu=0$, according to the hypothesis of the proposition. We will get a contradiction and finish the proof once we show that $\mu\neq 0$.

Let $\chi\in C_0^\infty(M)$ be supported in a coordinate patch $\kappa:V\subset M\to\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^d$. Multiply by χ each side of the equation $-h^2\Delta u(h)-u(h)=o(h)_{L^2}$, we have

$$-h^2\Delta(\chi u(h))-\chi u(h)=[-h^2\Delta,\chi]u+o(h)_{L^2}=O(h)_{H_h^1}+o(h)_{L^2}=O(h)_{L^2}. \tag{3.25}$$

$v(h):=\kappa^*(\chi u(h))$ satisfies the equation on Ω

$$-h^2\sum_{i,j}|g|^{-1/2}\partial_i g^{ij}|g|^{1/2}\partial_j v(h)-v(h)=O(h)_{L^2}. \tag{3.26}$$

We can extend the matrix g smoothly and elliptically (that is, g is everywhere positive definite) on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that when $|x|\geq R_0$ ($\Omega\subset B(0,R_0)$), $g(x)=\mathrm{Id}$, and consequently

$$\tilde{P}(h):=-\sum_{i,j}|g|^{-1/2}\partial_i g^{ij}|g|^{1/2}\partial_j \tag{3.27}$$

equals to the free Laplacian $-\Delta_0$ far away from the origin on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then (3.26) becomes a global equation posed on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and we are able to use the global pseudo-differential calculus on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and the symbol class $S^m_{1,0}(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d)=\big\{a\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d):|\partial_x^\alpha\partial_\xi^\beta a(x,\xi)|\leq C_{\alpha,\beta}\langle\xi\rangle^{m-|\beta|},\forall\alpha,\beta\in\mathbb{N}^d\big\}$ where $\langle\xi\rangle=(1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2}$. We will use the notation $S^m_{1,0}=S^m_{1,0}(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ for short. It is clear that for $a\in S^m_{1,0}$, $a(x,hD)$ defines a bounded operator from $H_h^{s+m}(\mathbb{R}^d)\to H_h^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ where $H_h^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ consists of those u with a finite H_h^s norm defined by $\|u\|_{H_h^s}=\|\langle hD\rangle^s u\|_{L^2}$.

Lemma 3.11. *$v(h)$ is h-oscillating, i.e.*

$$\lim_{R\to+\infty}\limsup_{h\to 0}\int_{|\xi|\geq R/h}\big|\widehat{v(h)}(\xi)\big|^2\mathrm{d}\xi=0. \tag{3.28}$$

This is a consequence of the elliptic equation (3.26). Indeed, write

$$\tilde{P}(h) = p_0(x, hD) + O(h)_{S^1_{1,0}}(x, hD),$$

where the principal symbol $p_0(x,\xi) = \sum_{i,j} g^{ij}(x)\xi_i\xi_j \in S^2_{1,0}$ is elliptic. The equation (3.26) becomes

$$p_0(x, hD)v(h) = v(h) + O(h)_{H_h^{-1}} = O(1)_{L^2} + O(h)_{H_h^{-1}}. \tag{3.29}$$

We claim there exists a $q \in S^{-2}_{1,0}$ and $\chi_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, such that

$$q(x,\xi)p_0(x,\xi) = 1 + \chi_0(\xi), \tag{3.30}$$

so that

$$q(x, hD)p_0(x, hD) = \mathrm{Id} + \chi_0(hD) + O(h)_{S^{-1}_{1,0}}(x, hD). \tag{3.31}$$

To construct such q, we follow [A-G] by first choosing a smooth function $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, such that $F(z) = 1/z$ for $|z| > 1$. And define

$$\begin{aligned} q(x,\xi) &:= \langle\xi\rangle^{-1} F\big(p_0(x,\xi)\langle\xi\rangle^{-1}\big) \in S^{-2}_{1,0} \\ &= \langle\xi\rangle^{-2} r(x,\xi), \end{aligned}$$

for $r(x,\xi) := \langle\xi\rangle^2 q(x,\xi) \in S^0_{1,0}$. Apply $q(x, hD)$ to each side of (3.29),

$$\begin{aligned} (1+\chi_0(hD))v(h) &= q(x,hD)\big(O(1)_{L^2} + O(h)_{H_h^{-1}}\big) + O(h)_{S^{-1}_{1,0}}(x,hD)O(1)_{L^2} \\ &= \langle hD\rangle^{-2}\big(O(1)_{L^2} + O(h)_{H_h^{-1}}\big) + O(h)_{S^{-3}_{1,0}}(x,hD)\big(O(1)_{L^2} + O(h)_{H_h^{-1}}\big) + O(h)_{H^1_h} \\ &= \langle hD\rangle^{-2} O(1)_{L^2} + O(h)_{H^1_h}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} v(h) &= -\chi_0(hD)v(h) + \langle hD\rangle^{-2} O(1)_{L^2} + O(h)_{H^1_h} \\ &= \chi_0(hD)O(1)_{L^2} + \langle hD\rangle^{-2} O(1)_{L^2} + o(1)_{L^2} \\ &= I + II + III. \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

I is localized in frequency, II is due to ellipticity, and III is a small remainder term. We estimate these terms separately.

$$\int_{|\xi|\geq R/h} |\hat{I}|^2 \mathrm{d}\xi = \int_{|\xi|\geq R/h} |\chi_0(h\xi)|^2 \big|\widehat{O(1)_{L^2}}(\xi)\big|^2 \mathrm{d}\xi = O\big(\sup_{|\xi|\geq R} |\chi_0(\xi)|^2\big) \tag{3.34}$$

$$\int_{|\xi|\geq R/h} \big|\widehat{II}\big|^2 \mathrm{d}\xi = \int_{|\xi|\geq R/h} \big|\langle h\xi\rangle^{-2}\widehat{O(1)_{L^2}}(\xi)\big|^2 \mathrm{d}\xi = O(R^{-4}) \tag{3.35}$$

$$\int_{|\xi|\geq R/h} \big|\widehat{III}\big|^2 \mathrm{d}\xi = o(1) \tag{3.36}$$

Combine the estimates above, we get

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \int_{|\xi|\geq R/h} \big|\widehat{v(h)}(\xi)\big|^2 \mathrm{d}\xi = O\big(\sup_{|\xi|\geq R} |\chi_0(\xi)|^2\big) + O(R^{-4}). \tag{3.37}$$

Hence $v(h)$ is h-oscillating because χ_0 is of compact support.

In order to show that $\mu \neq 0$, it suffices to show that for some χ, there exists a semiclassical measure of $\chi u(h_n)$ which non-null. Indeed, if the former is null, so is the latter. Choose χ which is supported in some coordinate patch, such that

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \|\chi u(h_n)\|_{L^2} > 0. \tag{3.38}$$

This could be done because $\|u(h_n)\|_{L^2} = 1$, and M is compact, because otherwise $\|u(h_n)\|_{L^2} \to 0$. Up to the extraction of a subsequence, we may assume that $\|\chi u(h_n)\|_{L^2} \to \delta > 0$ and that such a sequence corresponds to a semiclassical measure μ^χ. A coordinate patch for T^*M pushes forward μ^χ to a semiclassical measure $\tilde{\mu}^\chi$ on $T^*\Omega \simeq \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d$ of $v(h_n)$.

Choose $\psi \in C_c^\infty(B(0,1))$, $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, such that $0 \leq \psi, \varphi \leq 1$, $\psi = 1$ near $\xi = 0$, $\varphi = 1$ on $\operatorname{supp} \kappa^* \chi$. Pose $\psi_R(\xi) = \psi(x/R)$. Then by the definition of semiclassical defect measure,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \tilde{\mu}^\chi, \varphi(x)\psi_R(\xi) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{D}',\mathcal{D}} &= \lim_{n\to+\infty} \left(\varphi(x)\psi_R(h_nD)v(h_n), v(h_n)\right)_{L^2} \\
&= \lim_{n\to+\infty} \left(\psi_R(h_nD)v(h_n), v(h_n)\right)_{L^2} \\
&= \lim_{n\to+\infty} \left(\psi_R(h_n\xi)\widehat{v(h_n)}, \widehat{v(h_n)}\right)_{L^2} \\
&= \lim_{n\to+\infty} \|v(h_n)\|_{L^2}^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1-\psi_R(h_n\xi))\left|\widehat{v(h_n)}(\xi)\right|^2 \mathrm{d}\xi \\
&\geq \delta - \limsup_{h_n\to 0} \int_{|\xi|\geq R/h_n} \left|\widehat{v(h_n)}(\xi)\right|^2 \mathrm{d}\xi.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $R \to \infty$, since $v(h_n)$ is h_n-oscillating, by the monotone convergence theorem, we have

$$\left\langle \tilde{\mu}^\chi, \varphi(x) \times 1_\xi \right\rangle = \lim_{R\to\infty} \left\langle \tilde{\mu}^\chi, \varphi(x) \times \psi_R(\xi) \right\rangle \geq \delta > 0. \tag{3.39}$$

Therefore $\tilde{\mu}^\chi \neq 0$, so is not μ. □

To apply the proposition above, we now come back to the Zoll's surface of revolution Σ, and argue by contradiction to prove Proposition 1.13. Thus we may fix a pure sequence $u(\hat{h})$ of $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions, with $\|u(\hat{h})\|_{L^2(\Sigma)} = 1$, while $\|au(\hat{h})\|_{L^2(\Sigma)} = \|u(\hat{h})\|_{L^2(\Sigma^+)} = o(1)$. $u(\hat{h})$ satisfies the equation $\mathcal{L}u(\hat{h}) = \hat{h}^2 u(\hat{h})$, implying

$$(-\hat{h}^2\Delta - 1)u(\hat{h}) = O(\hat{h}^2)_{L^2}. \tag{3.40}$$

Observe that, by Proposition 3.1, the equator is the only geodesic that does not enter $U(a) = \Sigma^+$. By Proposition 3.10, the semiclassical measure μ must be supported in $S^*\Gamma$. For a closer look, let us study the Hamiltonian flow under the (x, φ) coordinates, denoting by (ξ, θ) the dual coordinates of the cotangent bundle. Now the symbol of the Laplace-Beltrami operator is $p(x, \varphi, \xi, \theta) = \frac{1}{\rho(x)^2}(\xi^2 + \theta^2)$, and the Hamiltonian equation reads

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x} = \partial_\xi p = \tfrac{2\xi}{\rho(x)^2}, \qquad & \dot{\varphi} = \partial_\theta p = \frac{2\theta}{\rho(x)^2}, \\
\dot{\xi} = -\partial_x p = \tfrac{2\rho'(x)}{\rho(x)^3}(\xi^2+\theta^2), \quad & \dot{\theta} = -\partial_\varphi p = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

In order that its trajectories be tangent to the equator, that is $\dot{x} = 0$, we must have $\xi = 0$. Therefore,

$$\operatorname{supp} \mu \subset S^*\Gamma \cap \{\xi = 0\} = \left\{(0, \varphi, 0, \pm 1) : \varphi \in \mathbb{S}^1\right\}. \tag{3.42}$$

Now it suffices to prove the observability of this chosen sequence $u(\hat{h})$, which satisfies (3.42). We prove it in the following sections.

3.6 Second Reduction: 1-D Stationary Schrödinger Equation

By Proposition 3.2, under the (x,φ) coordinates, each $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunction $u(\hat{h})$ with eigenvalue $\hat{h}^{-2} = (n+\beta/4)^2 = (n+1/2)^2$ is of the form

$$u(\hat{h})(x,\varphi) = \sum_{\substack{(\lambda,k)\\ \lambda^2\in I_n, k\in\mathbb{Z}}} \alpha_{\lambda,k} w_{\lambda,k}(x) e^{ik\varphi}, \tag{3.43}$$

where $w_{\lambda,k}$ are defined by Proposition 3.2 and $\alpha_{\lambda,k}$ are constant coefficients.

Recall the formula (3.9) of Laplacian under the isothermal coordinates. It suggests that the rotation number k, should be dominated by the eigenvalue λ.

Lemma 3.12. *There exists no pair (λ,k), except for $\lambda = k = 0$, where $k\in\mathbb{Z}$ and λ is an eigenvalue of $-\Delta$, such that $k^2 \geq \lambda^2$, and that (3.12) admits a non-trivial solution.*

Proof. We argue by contradiction. Suppose there exists a triple (k,λ,w) such that $0 \neq k^2 \geq \lambda^2$ and that

$$-\partial_x^2 w + k^2 w = \lambda^2\rho^2 w, \quad w(\pm\infty) = 0. \tag{3.44}$$

Since $w\in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ as will be shown by Corollary 3.23, it is legitimate to take L^2 inner product with w, and we get

$$0 \leq \|w'\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = (-w'', w)_{L^2} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\lambda^2\rho^2(x) - k^2)|w(x)|^2 \mathrm{d}x. \tag{3.45}$$

However, since $0\leq\rho\leq 1$, and that $\rho(x) < 1$ except for $x = 0$, we have $\lambda^2\rho(x)^2 - k^2 < 0$ except for $x = 0$. Therefore $w(x) = 0$ almost everywhere, which is a contradiction. □

Thanks to this lemma, it is legitimate to introduce the notations, for $\lambda > 0$.

$$h = \lambda^{-1}, \quad h^2k^2 = 1 - E, \quad 0 < E \leq 1, \tag{3.46}$$

and rewrite the equation (3.12) as a one-dimensional stationary Schrödinger equation on $\mathbb{R}$,

$$\big(-h^2\partial_x^2 + V\big)w = Ew, \ w(\pm\infty) = 0, \tag{3.47}$$

with the potential energy $V = 1-\rho^2$, such that $0\leq V < 1 = V(\pm\infty)$, $x = 0$ is the only potential minimum of V, and that $V(0) = V'(0) = 0,\ V''(0) > 0$. Here h varies as λ^2 varies in I_n, in order to avoid this complication and the possible abus of notatoin, from now on we denote

$$\hat{h} = (n+1/2)^{-1}, \quad \hat{E} = 1 - \hat{h}^2k^2. \tag{3.48}$$

The following lemma and the discussion which follows tell us we need only consider the case when $\hat{E} = o(1)$ as $h\to 0$.

Lemma 3.13. *Suppose $\{u(\hat{h})\}_{\hat{h}\to 0}$ is a pure and bounded sequnce in $L^2(M)$, with the $\hat{h}$-semiclassical defect measure being supported in $\{x = 0, \xi = 0\}$. Let $\delta > 0$, and $\chi_\delta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ which equals to 0 on $(-2\delta, 2\delta)^c$ and equals to 1 on $(-\delta,\delta)$. Then*

$$v(\hat{h}) := \big(1 - \chi_\delta(1 - \hat{h}^2D_\varphi^2)\big)u(\hat{h}) = o(1)_{L^2(M)}. \tag{3.49}$$

Proof. Let μ and ν be the semiclassically of $u(\hat{h})$ and $v(\hat{h})$ respectively. Since D_φ commute with Δ, and u_n satisfies the equation $(-\hat{h}^2\Delta - 1)u(\hat{h}) = O(\hat{h}^2)_{L^2}$, v_n satisfies

$$(-\hat{h}^2\Delta - 1)v(\hat{h}) = [-\hat{h}^2\Delta, 1 - \chi_\delta(1-\hat{h}^2D_\varphi^2)]u(\hat{h}) + O(\hat{h}^2)_{L^2}$$

$$= 0 + O(\hat{h}^2)_{L^2} = O(\hat{h}^2)_{L^2}.$$

ν should be supported in $S^*M = \{p = 1\}$ like μ, where p is the semiclassical principal symbol of $-h^2\Delta$, written in (x, φ) coordinates as

$$p(x, \varphi, \xi, \theta) = \frac{1}{\rho(x)^2}(\xi^2 + \theta^2). \tag{3.50}$$

Let $b \in C_c^\infty(T^*M)$ then,

$$\big(B(\hat{h})v(\hat{h}), v(\hat{h})\big)_{L^2(M)} \to \int_{T^*M} b(x, \varphi, \xi, \theta)\, \mathrm{d}\nu, \tag{3.51}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\big(B(\hat{h})v(\hat{h}), v(\hat{h})\big)_{L^2(M)} &= \big(B^\chi(\hat{h})u(\hat{h}), u(\hat{h})\big)_{L^2(M)} + O(\hat{h}) \\ &\to \int_{T^*M} (1 - \chi_\delta(1 - \theta^2))^2 b(x, \varphi, \xi, \theta)\, \mathrm{d}\mu,\end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

where $\sigma(B) = b$, and $B^\chi(\hat{h}) = \big(1-\chi_\delta(1-\hat{h}^2D_\varphi^2)\big)B(\hat{h})\big(1-\chi_\delta(1-\hat{h}^2D_\varphi^2)\big)$, with $\sigma(B^\chi) = (1-\chi_\delta(1-\theta^2))^2 b$. If $\operatorname{supp} b \cap \{x = 0, \xi = 0\} = \emptyset$, then $\int_{T^*M} b(x, \varphi, \xi, \theta)\, \mathrm{d}\nu = 0$ since $\operatorname{supp}\mu \subset \{x = 0, \xi = 0\}$. Therefore $\operatorname{supp}\nu \subset \{x = 0, \xi = 0\}$. If $\operatorname{supp} b \subset \{|1 - \theta^2| \leq \delta\}$, then $(1 - \chi_\delta(1 - \theta^2))^2 b = 0$, and consequently $\int_{T^*M} b(x, \varphi, \xi, \theta)\, \mathrm{d}\nu = 0$. Therefore $\operatorname{supp}\nu \subset S^*M \cap \{x = 0, \xi = 0\} \cap \{|1-\theta^2| > \delta\} = \emptyset$, that is $\nu = 0$. If $v(\hat{h}) \neq o(1)_{L^2}$, then up to the extraction of a subsequence, $\|v(\hat{h})\|_{L^2} \geq \epsilon > 0$ for some ϵ. It is a consequence of the proof of Proposition 3.10 that $v(\hat{h})$ is $\hat{h}$-oscillating and consequently $\nu \neq 0$. This is a contradiction. □

To apply this lemma, we first fix a sequence $\delta(\hat{h}) \to 0$ as $\hat{h} \to 0$. Then use a diagonal process, we can find a subsequence, still denoted by $u = u(\hat{h})$, such that

$$\big(1 - \chi_{\delta(\hat{h})}(1 - \hat{h}^2 D_\varphi^2)\big)u(\hat{h}) = o(1)_{L^2}, \tag{3.53}$$

which implies the following decomposition

$$u(\hat{h}) = \sum_{\substack{(\lambda,k) \\ \lambda^2 \in I_n, \hat{E} \leq \delta(\hat{h})}} \beta_{\lambda,k} w_{\lambda,k}(x) e^{ik\varphi} + o(1)_{L^2} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} w_{\hat{h},k}(x) e^{ik\varphi} + o(1)_{L^2} \tag{3.54}$$

where $\beta_{\lambda,k} = \chi_{\delta(\hat{h})}(1 - \hat{h}^2k^2)\alpha_{\lambda,k}$ and

$$w_{\hat{h},k}(x) = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \\ \lambda^2 \in I_n, \hat{E} \leq \delta(\hat{h})}} \beta_{\lambda,k} w_{\lambda,k}(x), \tag{3.55}$$

By (3.47), $w_{\lambda,k}$ should satisfy the

$$\begin{aligned}\big(-\hat{h}^2\partial_x^2 + V\big)w_{\lambda,k} &= \hat{E}w_{\lambda,k} + \big((\hat{h}^2h^{-2}E - \hat{E}) + (1 - \hat{h}^2h^{-2})V\big)w_{\lambda,k} \\ &= \hat{E}w_{\lambda,k} + (\hat{h}^2h^{-2} - 1)\rho^2 w_{\lambda,k} \\ &= \hat{E}w_{\lambda,k} + Rw_{\lambda,k},\end{aligned} \tag{3.56}$$

where R is an operator which is linear defined by posing $Rw_{\lambda,k} = (\hat{h}^2h^{-2} - 1)\rho^2 w_{\lambda,k}$. Summing up, we obtain the equation for $w_{\hat{h},k}$

$$(-\hat{h}^2\partial_x^2 + V)w_{\hat{h},k} = \hat{E}w_{\hat{h},k} + Rw_{\hat{h},k}. \tag{3.57}$$

Observe that $Rw_{\hat{h},k}$ is a small remainder term in the sense that

$$\|Rw_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2} = O(\hat{h}^2)\|w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.58}$$

Indeed, by the orthogonality of $\{w_{\lambda,k}\}_\lambda$ with respect to the inner product $(\cdot,\cdot)_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Rw_{\hat{h},k}\|^2_{L^2} &\leq \|\rho^2\|_{L^\infty}\|\sum_{\substack{(\lambda,k)\\ \lambda^2\in I_n,\hat{E}\leq\delta(\hat{h})}} O(\hat{h}^2)\beta_{\lambda,k}w_{\lambda,k}\|^2_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}} = \sum_{\substack{(\lambda,k)\\ \lambda^2\in I_n,\hat{E}\leq\delta(\hat{h})}} O(\hat{h}^4)\|\beta_{\lambda,k}w_{\lambda,k}\|^2_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}}\\
&\leq O(\hat{h}^4)\sum_{\substack{(\lambda,k)\\ \lambda^2\in I_n,\hat{E}\leq\delta(\hat{h})}} \|\beta_{\lambda,k}w_{\lambda,k}\|^2_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}} = O(\hat{h}^4)\|\sum_{\substack{(\lambda,k)\\ \lambda^2\in I_n,\hat{E}\leq\delta(\hat{h})}} \beta_{\lambda,k}w_{\lambda,k}\|^2_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}}\\
&= O(\hat{h}^4)\|w_{\hat{h},k}\|^2_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}} \leq O(\hat{h}^4)\|w_{\hat{h},k}\|^2_{L^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.59}$$

Using the orthogonality of $\{e^{ik\varphi}\}_k$ on $[0,2\pi]$, we can reduce the observability of $u(\hat{h})$ to the observability of $w_{\hat{h},k}$.

Lemma 3.14. *There exists a constant $C>0$ such that for all $w_{\hat{h},k}$, the following observability holds,*

$$\|w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}(x>0)} \geq C\|w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}(\mathbb{R})}. \tag{3.60}$$

Proof. The proof requires some results which will be proved in the following sections. First, by Corollary 3.24, we may drop the weight ρ^2 and work on the usual Lebesgue measure and the estimates of the $L^2_{\mathrm{d}x}$ norm. Then we argue by contradiction, and extract a subsequence $\{w_{\hat{h},k} : k = k(\hat{h})\}_{\hat{h}\to 0}$ with $\hat{E} = 1-\hat{h}^2k^2 = o(1)$, such that after a proper normalisation (that is, up to a multiplicative constant coefficient) $\|w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2(x>0)} = o(1)$ while $\|w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2} = 1$. By extraction, we further assume either $\hat{E} = O(\hat{h})$ or $\hat{E} \gg \hat{h}$, and get a contradiction by Corollary 3.27 and Proposition 3.28 respectively. □

Applying this lemma, we can finish the proof of Proposition 1.13 from which Theorem 1.7 follows directly.

Proof of Proposition 1.13 and Theorem 1.7. For n sufficiently large, by Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big\|\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} w_{\hat{h},k}e^{ik\varphi}\Big\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma^+)} &= 2\pi\int_0^\infty \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |w_{\hat{h},k}(x)|^2\rho(x)^2\mathrm{d}x\\
&\geq 2\pi C\int_{-\infty}^\infty \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |w_{\hat{h},k}(x)|^2\rho(x)^2\mathrm{d}x = C\Big\|\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} w_{\hat{h},k}e^{ik\varphi}\Big\|^2_{L^2(\Sigma)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.61}$$

Therefore by (3.54) we obtain the observability of $u(\hat{h})$, contradicting to our early assumption that the observability of $u(\hat{h})$ does not hold. That is how we obtain the observability of the $\mathcal{L}$-eigenfunctions, and consequently the stabilisation property of (DW) on Σ. □

The following sections are devoted to proving the results we used in the proof of Lemma 3.14.

3.7 Some Agmon Type Estimates

In this section $P(\tau) = -h^2\Delta + V(x)$ is a Schrödinger operator on $\mathbb{R}^d$, where h and the potential V both depend on a parameter $\tau \to 0$ (or some other general limit process). Two cases are most important, and will be used in the following sections. The first is when $h \equiv 1$ does not depend on τ, then we get a classical Schrödinger operator. The second is when $h \equiv \tau$, and we get a semiclassical Schrödinger operator. In future application, V should converge, uniformly on compact sets, to V_0, a potential well with a single non-degenerate potential mininum, usually $V_0(x) = x^2$. But the discussions below treats more general cases.

The following proposition and the idea of some following proofs come from [D-S].

Proposition 3.15. *Let $u \in C_c^2\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ and let $\Phi \in \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{loc}}\left(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}\right)$ be real valued and locally Lipschitizian. Then the following identity holds,*

$$\begin{aligned} h^2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\nabla\left(e^{\Phi/h}u\right)\right|^2\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left(V(x)-|\nabla\Phi|^2\right)e^{2\Phi/h}\left|u\right|^2\mathrm{d}x \\ = \Re\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{2\Phi/h}P(\tau)u(x)\overline{u(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{3.62}$$

We want to remove the restriction that u is of compact support from the identity (3.62), to do this, we choose a cut-off function $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $0 \le \chi \le 1$ and $\chi \equiv 1$ near the origin. And set $u_R(x) = \chi(x/R)u(x)$. Then $u_R \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R})$, and the identity (3.62) could be applied.

$$\begin{aligned} h^2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\nabla\left(e^{\Phi/h}u_R\right)\right|^2\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left(V(x)-|\nabla\Phi|^2\right)e^{2\Phi/h}\left|u_R\right|^2\mathrm{d}x \\ = \Re\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{2\Phi/h}P(\tau)u_R(x)\overline{u_R(x)}\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that $u \in D(P(\tau)) = \left\{w \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) : V(x)w \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \Delta w \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)\right\}$, then $D(P(\tau)) \supset H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and it contains those functions w such that $P(\tau)w \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. By dominant control theorem, $u_R \to u$ and $Vu_R \to Vu$ both strongly in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. By

$$\begin{aligned} P(\tau)u_R &= \chi(x/R)P(\tau)u + [-h^2\Delta, \chi(x/R)]w \\ &= \chi(x/R)P(\tau)u - 2\frac{h^2}{R}\chi'(x/R)w' - \frac{h^2}{R^2}\chi''(x/R)w, \end{aligned}$$

we see that $P(\tau)u_R \to P(\tau)u$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $R \to \infty$. If the phase function Φ is constant for $|x|$ large, then we are allowed to let $R \to \infty$ under the integrals to get the following corollary

Corollary 3.16. *Suppose $u \in D(P(\tau))$, and Φ is constant for $|x|$ large, then the identity (3.62) holds.*

Now suppose further that u satisfies the equation,

$$P(\tau)u = E(\tau)u + f(\tau), \tag{3.63}$$

with some additional assumptions:

1. $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
2. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $\tau_\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta_\varepsilon > 0$, $R_\varepsilon > 0$, $C_\varepsilon > 0$, such that for $0 < \tau < \tau_\varepsilon$, if $|x| \ge R_\varepsilon$, then $V(x) \ge E(\tau) + \delta_\varepsilon$; if $|x| \le R_\varepsilon$, then $|V(x;\tau) - E(\tau)| < C_\varepsilon$, and $\Phi^\varepsilon(x;\tau) \le \varepsilon$, where $\Phi^\varepsilon(x;\tau)$ is defined as follows.

First we define the Agmon distance

$$d(x_1, x_2; \tau) := \Big| \int_{x_1}^{x_2} (V(t;\tau) - E(\tau))_+^{1/2} \, \mathrm{d}t \Big|. \tag{3.64}$$

For some $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, let

$$\Phi^\varepsilon(x;\tau) = (1-\varepsilon) d(x,0;\tau), \quad \Phi_R^\varepsilon(x;\tau) = \chi_R(\Phi^\varepsilon(x;\tau)), \tag{3.65}$$

where $\chi_R(t) = 1_{t\le R}(t)t + 1_{t>R}(t)R$. Therefore Φ_R^ε is constant, equalling to R, for $|x|$ sufficiently large, since the second assumption implies that $\Phi^\varepsilon(x;\tau) \to \infty$ as $|x| \to \infty$, uniformly for τ sufficiently small. The corollary above applies, and yields

$$\begin{aligned} h^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left|\nabla\left(e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} u\right)\right|^2 \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(V(x;\tau) - E(\tau) - |\nabla \Phi_R^\varepsilon|^2\right) e^{2\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} |u|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x \\ = \Re \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} f u \, \mathrm{d}x \le \|e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} f\|_{L^2} \|e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} u\|_{L^2} \\ \le \frac{(1-(1-\varepsilon)^2\delta_\varepsilon)}{2} \|e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} u\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\varepsilon' \|e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} f\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.66}$$

For $0 < \tau < \tau_\varepsilon$ and $|x| \ge R_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} V(x;\tau) - E(\tau) - |\nabla \Phi_R^\varepsilon|^2 &\ge \left(1 - (1-\varepsilon)^2\right) \left(V(x;\tau) - E(\tau)\right) \\ &\ge \left(1 - (1-\varepsilon)^2\right) \delta_\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{3.67}$$

Seperating domain the integrals in (3.66) into two parts $|x| \ge R_\varepsilon$ and $|x| < R_\varepsilon$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} h^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left|\nabla\left(e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} u\right)\right|^2 \mathrm{d}x + \frac{\left(1-(1-\varepsilon)^2\right)\delta_\varepsilon}{2} \int_{|x|\ge R_\varepsilon} e^{2\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} |u|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x - C_\varepsilon' \|e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} f\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \le \left(\|V(x;\tau) - E(\tau) + \nabla \Phi_R^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(|x|\le R_\varepsilon)} + \frac{(1-(1-\varepsilon^2\delta_\varepsilon))}{2} \right) \\ \times \int_{|x|\le R_\varepsilon} e^{2\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} |u|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x \\ \le C_\varepsilon'' \int_{|x|\le R_\varepsilon} e^{2\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} |u|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

Adding $\frac{\left(1-(1-\varepsilon)^2\right)\delta_\varepsilon}{2} \int_{|x|\le R_\varepsilon} e^{2\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} |u|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x$ to each side of the inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} h^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left|\nabla\left(e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} u\right)\right|^2 \mathrm{d}x + \frac{\left(1-(1-\varepsilon)^2\right)\delta_\varepsilon}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{2\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} |u|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x - C_\varepsilon' \|e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} f\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \le C_\varepsilon''' \int_{|x|\le R_\varepsilon} e^{2\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} |u|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x \le C_\varepsilon''' \sup_{|x|\le R_\varepsilon} \left(e^{2\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h}\right) \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \le C_\varepsilon''' e^{2\varepsilon/h} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 . \end{aligned}$$

This proves the following proposition.

Proposition 3.17. *(Inhomogeneous Agmon Estimate) Under the assumptions above, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\tau_\varepsilon > 0$ and $C(\varepsilon) > 0$, such that for $0 < \tau < \tau_\varepsilon$, and $R > 0$, the following estimate holds*

$$\left\|h\nabla\left(e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} u\right)\right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\|e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} u\right\|_{L^2}^2 \le C(\varepsilon)\Big(e^{2\varepsilon/h}\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h} f\|_{L^2}^2\Big). \tag{3.68}$$

The following two corollaries are important.

Corollary 3.18. *(Homogeneous Agmon Estimate) If $f = 0$, then we obtain the usual (homogeneous) Agmon estimate,*

$$\left\|h\nabla\left(e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h}u\right)\right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\|e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h}u\right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\varepsilon)e^{2\varepsilon/h}\|u\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{3.69}$$

Observe that, the right hand side of this estimate does not depend on R, we are thus allowed to let $\mathbb{R} \to \infty$, and get a finer estimate,

$$\left\|h\nabla\left(e^{\Phi^\varepsilon/h}u\right)\right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\|e^{\Phi^\varepsilon/h}u\right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\varepsilon)e^{2\varepsilon/h}\|u\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{3.70}$$

Corollary 3.19. *Let $\chi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be supported in the interior of $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \Phi_R^\varepsilon(x) = R\}$, such that $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$, then*

$$\|\chi h\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\chi u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\varepsilon)\left(e^{-2(R-\varepsilon)/h}\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|f\|_{L^2}^2\right). \tag{3.71}$$

Remark 3.20. For any $\delta > 0$, we could modify the phase function Φ_R^ε to some $\tilde{\Phi}_R$, so that $\tilde{\Phi}_R \equiv R$ for $|x| \geq R_\varepsilon + \delta$, while $\tilde{\Phi}_R = \Phi_R^\varepsilon$ for $|x| \leq R_\varepsilon$.

Remark 3.21. This is a classical estimate by reversing the operator $-h^2\partial_x^2 + V(x)$ in the classical forbidden region, when V is independent of $\tau \equiv h$. For our application in Section 3.9, where the potential is $V_{\hat{E}}$, it is believed that such a semiclassical analysis suffices. However, we decide to use the approach above for simplicity to avoid technique problems caused by the behaviour of $V_{\hat{E}}$ at faraway from the origin.

Proof. Simply notice that

$$\chi\nabla(e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h}u) = e^{R/h}\chi\nabla u, \quad \chi e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h}u = e^{R/h}\chi u, \quad \|e^{\Phi_R^\varepsilon/h}f\|_{L^2} \leq e^{R/h}\|f\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.72}$$

The rest of the proof is a straightforward application of the previous proposition. □

We want to apply the discussion above to $w_{\hat{h},k}$, with $h = \hat{h} = \tau$, which satisfies (3.57). Here $P(\hat{h}) = -\hat{h}^2\partial_x^2 + V$, and $E(\hat{h}) = \hat{E} = o(1)$, and $f = Rw_{\hat{h},k}$. The two assumptions are trivially verified. We only need to show that $w \in D(P(\hat{h}))$. This requires the following proposition from [Olv].

Proposition 3.22. *Let $I = (a_-, a_+)$ be a finite or infinite interval of the real line. Let $f \in C^2\left(\bar{I}\right)$ be real and positive, and g be a continuous real or complex function. Let*

$$F(x) = \int \left\{f^{-1/4}\partial_x^2\left(f^{-1/4}\right) - gf^{-1/2}\right\}\mathrm{d}x \tag{3.73}$$

be a primitive function of the integrand. Then in I the differential equation

$$\partial_x^2 u = (f + g)u \tag{3.74}$$

has twice continuously differentiable solutions

$$u_\pm(x) = f^{-1/4}(x)\exp\left\{\pm\int f^{1/2}(x)\mathrm{d}x\right\}(1 + \varepsilon_\pm(x)) \tag{3.75}$$

with estimates

$$|\varepsilon_\pm(x)|, \frac{1}{2}f^{-1/2}(x)\left|\varepsilon_\pm'(x)\right| \leq \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}_{a_\pm,x}(F)\right\} - 1 \tag{3.76}$$

provided the total variation $\mathcal{V}_{a_\pm,x}(F)$ of F on the interval $(a_\pm, x)$ being finite. If g is real, then the solutions are real.

Corollary 3.23. *Up to a multiplicative constant, the solution $w_{\lambda,k}$ on the interval (R_0,∞) is of the form*

$$w_{\lambda,k}(x) = [V(x)-E]^{-1/4} \exp\Big\{ -h\int_0^x [V(t)-E]^{1/2}\,\mathrm{d}t\Big\}\,(1+\varepsilon(x)) \tag{3.77}$$

with estimates $|\varepsilon(y)|\,,|\varepsilon'(y)| = O(h)$. We can do the same on $(-\infty,-R_0)$, consequently, $w_{\lambda,k}\in H^1(\mathbb{R})$. Since $V\in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, we deduce that $w_{\lambda,k}\in D(P(\hat h))$. Observing that $w_{\hat h,k}$ is a finite sum of $w_{\lambda,k}$, it should belong to $D(P(\hat h))$ as well.

Proof. Apply the previous proposition with $f = h^{-2}(V-E)$ and $g=0$. Then

$$F(x) = h\int_c^x [V(t)-E]^{-1/4}\,\partial_t^2\,[V(t)-E]^{-1/4}\,\mathrm{d}t,$$

from which, for $x>R_0$,

$$\mathcal{V}_{x,\infty}(F) \le Ch\delta^{-5/2}\big(\,\|r'\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|r''\|_{L^\infty}\,\big)\int_{\mathbb{R}}\rho^2(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = O(h)$$

since $V(x) = 1-\rho^2(x) = 1-r^2(f(x))$, $f'(x) = r(f(x))$, and that

$$\int \rho^2(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\mathrm{d}\varphi\int\rho^2(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \mathrm{vol}(M) < \infty. \tag{3.78}$$

□

The Agmon estimate allows us to remove the weight ρ^2 in the L^2 estimate of $w_{\hat h,k}$, and consider only the Lebesgue measure. Indeed we have

Corollary 3.24. *1. $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2}$ and $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}}$ are comparable, that is, for some constant $C>0$,*

$$C^{-1}\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}} \le \|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2} \le C\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}} \tag{3.79}$$

2. The observability of $w_{\hat h,k}$ is irrelevant of the choice between norms $\|\cdot\|_{L^2_{\mathrm{d}x}}$ or $\|\cdot\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}}$, that is, $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}(x>0)} \ge C\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}}$ for some $C>0$, if and only if $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2(x>0)} \ge C'\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2}$ for some $C'>0$.

Proof. Indeed, in this case, $\|f\|_{L^2} = \|Rw_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2} = O(\hat h^2)\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2}$ by (3.58).

Now we fix $0<\varepsilon<1$, and fix $R>2\varepsilon$, then for some $R_0>0$, $\chi = 1_{|x|>R_0}$ is supported in $\{\Phi_R^\varepsilon = R\}$. Apply Corollary 3.19, $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2(|x|>R_0)} \le C(\varepsilon)O(\hat h^2)\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2}$. Evidently, $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2(|x|<R_0)}$ and $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}(|x|<R_0)}$ are comparable, with some constant depending only on $\inf_{|x|<R_0}\rho^2(x)>0$. Therefore, $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2}$ and $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}}$ will be comparable, finishing the proof of the first statement.

Moreover, the exact same argument shows that $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2(0<x<R_0)}$ and $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}(0<x<R_0)}$ are also comparable, and that $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2(|x|>R_0)}$ and $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}(|x|>R_0)}$ are negligible, therefore the two observabilities, which states that $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2(x>0)}$ and $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}(x>0)}$ majorate $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2}$ and $\|w_{\hat h,k}\|_{L^2_{\rho^2\mathrm{d}x}}$ respectively, are consequently equivalent. This proves the second statement. □

3.8 Case 1: $\hat{E} = O(\hat{h})$

In this section, we fix a sequence $\{w_{\hat{h},k} : k = k(\hat{h})\}_{\hat{h}\to 0}$, with $\hat{E} = 1 - \hat{h}^2 k(\hat{h})^2 = O(\hat{h})$. We will show that when $\hat{h}$ is sufficiently small, $w_{\lambda,k} = w_{\hat{h},k}$ for some $\lambda > 0$ (Corollary 3.27), therefore the observability of $w_{\hat{h},k}$ comes from that of $w_{\lambda,k}$.

We start by proving the observability of $w_{\lambda,k}$, and fix a sequence $\{w(\hat{h}) = w_{\lambda,k} : \lambda = \lambda(\hat{h}), k = k(\hat{h})\}_{\hat{h}\to 0}$, where each $w_{\lambda,k}$ appears as an additive factor of $w_{\hat{h},k}$. Observe that $h = \hat{h}\big(1 + O(\hat{h}^2)\big)$ and $E = \hat{E} + O(\hat{h}^2)$. (3.47) becomes (this is in fact (3.56) in a different form)

$$\Big(-\hat{h}^2\partial_x^2 + \big(1 + O(\hat{h}^2)\big)V\Big)w(\hat{h}) = \big(\hat{E} + O(\hat{h}^2)\big)w(\hat{h}). \tag{3.80}$$

Suppose that $V(x) = cx^2 + O(x^3)$ for $|x| \le 1$. By extraction, we assume that

$$c^{-1/2}\hat{h}^{-1}\hat{E} \to F_0 \tag{3.81}$$

as $\hat{h} \to 0$ for some non-negative constant F_0, and apply the following rescaling to equation (3.80)

$$z = c^{1/4}\hat{h}^{-1/2}x, \quad V_{\hat{h}}(z) = c^{-1/2}\hat{h}^{-1}\big(1 + O(\hat{h}^2)\big)V(c^{-1/4}\hat{h}^{1/2}z). \tag{3.82}$$

And we use the notation $L^2,\ H^1,\ H^1_h$ to denote the classical and semiclassical Sobolev spaces with respect to the measure $\mathrm{d}z$ for short, unless otherwise specified. Now (3.80) becomes the classical stationary Schrödinger equation under the z coordinate,

$$\big(-\partial_z^2 + V_{\hat{h}}\big)w(\hat{h}) = \big(F_0 + o(1)\big)w(\hat{h}). \tag{3.83}$$

Observe that $V_{\hat{h}}(z) = \big(1 + O(\hat{h}^2)\big)\big(z^2 + \hat{h}^{1/2}O(z^3)\big)$ for $|z| \le c^{1/4}\hat{h}^{-1/2}$. From now on we will write $w = w(\hat{h})$ for short. We apply Proposition 3.18 with

$$\tau = \hat{h},\ h \equiv 1,\ P := -\partial_z^2 + V_{\hat{h}}(z),\ \Phi^\varepsilon(z;\hat{h}) = (1-\varepsilon)\Big|\int_0^z \big(V_{\hat{h}}(t) - F_0\big)_+^{1/2}\,\mathrm{d}t\Big|,$$

Then we have

$$\big\|\partial_z\big(e^{\Phi^\varepsilon}w\big)\big\|_{L^2}^2 + \big\|e^{\Phi^\varepsilon}w\big\|_{L^2}^2 \le C(\varepsilon)\,\|w\|_{L^2}^2\,, \tag{3.84}$$

implying

$$\big\|e^{\Phi^\varepsilon}w\big\|_{L^2} + \big\|\hat{h}^{1/2}e^{\Phi^\varepsilon}\partial_z w\big\|_{L^2} \le C(\varepsilon)\,\|w\|_{L^2}\,. \tag{3.85}$$

Indeed, the factor $\hat{h}^{1/2}$ comes from the L^∞ norm of $V_{\hat{h}}^{1/2}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|\hat{h}^{1/2}e^{\Phi^\varepsilon}\partial_z w\big\|_{L^2} &\le \|\hat{h}^{1/2}\partial_z\big(e^{\Phi^\varepsilon}w\big)\|_{L^2} + \|\hat{h}^{1/2}\partial_z\Phi^\varepsilon e^{\Phi^\varepsilon}w\|_{L^2}\\ &\le \hat{h}C(\varepsilon)\|w\|_{L^2} + (1-\varepsilon)(\|V\|_{L^\infty} + O(\hat{h}))^{1/2}\|e^{\Phi^\varepsilon}w\|_{L^2}\\ &\le C(\varepsilon)\|w\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Phi^\epsilon(z;\hat{h}) \ge \alpha\,(|z| - M)$ for some $\alpha, M > 0$ and is uniform for all $\varepsilon, \hat{h}$, we have

$$\|w\|_{H^1_{\hat{h}^{1/2}}(|z|\ge R)} = \|w\|_{L^2(|z|\ge R)} + \|\hat{h}^{1/2}\partial_z w\|_{L^2(|z|\ge R)} = O\big(e^{-\alpha R}\big)\,\|w\|_{L^2}\,. \tag{3.86}$$

We normalize w so that $\|w\|_{L^2} = 1$. Fix for some $0 < \delta < 1/6$, and let $\tilde{w}(z) = \chi\big(\hat{h}^\delta z\big)w(z)$ where $\chi \in C_0^\infty$ is a cut-off function equalling to 1 near the origin. Therefore

$$w = \tilde{w} + O\big(e^{-\alpha\hat{h}^{-\delta}}\big)_{H^1_{\hat{h}^{1/2}}} = \tilde{w} + O(\hat{h}^{-1/2}e^{-\alpha\hat{h}^{-\delta}})_{H^1} = \tilde{w} + O(\hat{h}^\infty)_{H^1}. \tag{3.87}$$

Observing that on the support of $\tilde{w}$, $V_{\hat{h}}(z) = z^2 + O\big(\hat{h}^{1/2-3\delta}\big)$, we commute $\chi(\hat{h}^{-\delta}\cdot)$ with (3.83) and obtain the equation for $\tilde{w}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\left(-\partial_z^2 + z^2 - F_0\right)\tilde{w} &= \left(o(1) + O\big(\hat{h}^{1/2-3\delta}\big)_{L^\infty}\right)\tilde{w} + \left[\partial_z^2, \chi\big(\hat{h}^\delta z\big)\right]w \\ &= o(1)_{L^\infty}\tilde{w} + 2\hat{h}^\delta\chi'\big(\hat{h}^\delta z\big)w' + \hat{h}^{2\delta}\chi''\big(\hat{h}^\delta z\big)w \\ &= o(1)_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.88}$$

Let $\{v_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the complete set of normalized eigenfunctions of the classical harmonic oscillator, $-\partial_z^2 + z^2$, such that

$$\left(-\partial_z^2 + z^2\right)v_i = (2i+1)v_i. \tag{3.89}$$

And write $w(\hat{h}) = \sum \alpha_i(\hat{h})v_i$. Then we have

$$\sum_{i\geq 0}|\alpha_i|^2 = \|\tilde{w}\|_{L^2}^2 = \|w\|_{L^2}^2 + o(1) = 1 + o(1). \tag{3.90}$$

By (3.88),

$$o(1)_{L^2} = \left(-\partial_z^2 + z^2 - F_0\right)\tilde{w} = \sum_{i\geq 0}\left(2i + 1 - F_0\right)\alpha_i v_i, \tag{3.91}$$

we have

$$\sum_{i\geq 0}\left(2i+1-F_0\right)^2|\alpha_i|^2 = o(1). \tag{3.92}$$

Let i_0 be the integer such that $|2i_0 + 1 - F_0|$ is the minimum among all $|2i+1-F_0|$. Then for any integer $i \neq i_0$, $|2i+1-F_0| \geq |i - i_0|$, and hence,

$$\Big\|\sum_{i\neq i_0}\alpha_i v_i\Big\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{i\neq i_0}|\alpha_i|^2 = o(1). \tag{3.93}$$

Combined with (3.90), we have

$$\alpha_{i_0} = 1 + o(1). \tag{3.94}$$

By consequence,

$$\tilde{w} = \alpha_{i_0}v_{i_0} + \sum_{i\neq i_0}\alpha_i v_i = \alpha_{i_0}v_{i_0} + o(1)_{L^2} = v_{i_0} + o(1)_{L^2}. \tag{3.95}$$

Moreover, by (3.92), $\left(2i_0 + 1 - F_0\right)|\alpha_{i_0}|^2 = o(1)$, we must have $F_0 = 2i_0 + 1$. Summing up, we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 3.25. *Let the sequence $\{w(\hat{h}) = w_{\lambda,k} : \lambda = \lambda(\hat{h}), k = k(\hat{h})\}_{\hat{h}\to 0}$ be defined as above, be normalized by $\|w(\hat{h})\|_{L^2} = 1$, and satisfy the equation (3.83). Then $F_0 = 2i_0+1$ for some $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, and*

$$w = v_{i_0} + o(1)_{L^2}, \tag{3.96}$$

where v_{i_0} is the eigenfunction of the harmonic oscillator $-\partial_z^2+z^2$ to the eigenvalue $2i+1$, normalized in L^2 norm, $\|v_{i_0}\|_{L^2} = 1$. In particular the observability $\|w(\hat{h})\|_{L^2(x>0)} \geq C\|w(\hat{h})\|_{L^2}$ holds for some constant $C > 0$ by the classical result that v_{i_0} is either an even function or an odd function.

Remark 3.26. We can do better, in fact, by some elementary computation, we are able to show that $w = v_{i_0} + o(1)_{H^1}$. However we don't do it here because we won't need it.

Corollary 3.27. *Let $\{w_{\hat{h},k} : k = k(\hat{h})\}_{\hat{h}\to 0}$ be defined as above, such that $\hat{E} = 1 - \hat{h}^2 k(\hat{h})^2 = O(\hat{h})$, then for $\hat{h}$ sufficiently small, there exists at most one $\lambda > 0$, such that up to a multiplicative constant, $w_{\lambda,k}$ appeared as an additive factor of $w_{\hat{h},k}$. In particular, $w_{\hat{h},k} = w_{\lambda,k}$ and the observability of $w_{\hat{h},k}$ follows from that of $w_{\lambda,k}$.*

Proof. If this is not true, we could find two sequences $\{w_{\lambda_i,k} : \lambda_i = \lambda_i(\hat{h}), k = k(\hat{h})\}_{\hat{h}\to 0}$ $(i = 1, 2)$, such that $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ for all $\hat{h}$, and that $w_{\lambda_i,k}$ appear as additive factors in $w_{\hat{h},k}$. Let F_0 be defined by

$$F_0 = c^{-1/2}\hat{h}^{-1}\hat{E} + o(1), \tag{3.97}$$

If we normalize $w_{\lambda_i,k}$ such that $\|w_{\lambda_i,k}\|_{L^2} = 1$, then $w_{\lambda_i,k} = v + o(1)_{L^2}$, $i = 1, 2$, where $v = v_{i_0}$ is determined by Proposition 3.25. Since $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$, by orthogonality (Proposition 3.2), as $\hat{h} \to 0$,

$$0 = (w_{\lambda_1,k}, w_{\lambda_2,k})_{L^2_{\rho^2 \mathrm{d}z}} \to (v, v)_{L^2_{\rho^2 \mathrm{d}z}} > 0, \tag{3.98}$$

which is a contradiction. □

3.9 Case 2: $\hat{E} \gg \hat{h}$

We fix a sequence $\{w_{\hat{h},k} : k = k(\hat{h})\}_{\hat{h}\to 0}$ with $\hat{E} = 1 - \hat{h}^2 k(\hat{h})^2 \gg \hat{h}$ as $\hat{h} \to 0$, and assume as before $V(x) = cx^2 + O(x^3)$ for $|x| \leq 1$, but use a different scaling,

$$z = c^{1/2}\hat{E}^{-1/2}x, \quad \tilde{h} = c^{1/2}\hat{E}^{-1}\hat{h}, \quad V_{\hat{E}}(z) = \hat{E}^{-1}V\big(c^{-1/2}\hat{E}^{1/2}z\big), \tag{3.99}$$

such that $V_{\hat{E}}(z) \to z^2$ uniformly on bounded sets. As before, we use the notation $L^2 = L^2_{\mathrm{d}z}$ and $H^1 = H^1_{\mathrm{d}z}$ for short. And we normalize $\|w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2} = 1$. Then equation (3.57) becomes

$$\big(-\tilde{h}^2\partial_z^2 + V_{\hat{E}}\big)w_{\hat{h},k} = w_{\hat{h},k} + \hat{E}^{-1}Rw_{\hat{h},k}, \tag{3.100}$$

with estimate

$$\|\hat{E}^{-1}Rw_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2} = O(\hat{h}^2/\hat{E})\|w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2} = o(\hat{h}). \tag{3.101}$$

Applying Corollary 3.19 and the remark after it, for any cut-off function $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ which equals to 1 on a neighbourhood of $|z| \leq 1$, and $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$,

$$\|(1-\chi)\tilde{h}\partial_z w_{\hat{h},k}\|^2_{L^2} + \|(1-\chi)w_{\hat{h},k}\|^2_{L^2} = O(\tilde{h}^\infty)\|w_{\hat{h},k}\|^2_{L^2} + o(\hat{h}^2) = o(\tilde{h}^2), \tag{3.102}$$

which implies that

$$\|\chi w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2} = 1 + o(\tilde{h}), \tag{3.103}$$

and that it suffices to prove the observability for $\chi w_{\hat{h},k}$. Choose another cut-off function $\tilde{\chi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, such that $\chi\tilde{\chi} = \chi$, then $\chi w_{\hat{h},k}$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned}\big(-\tilde{h}^2\partial_z^2 + \tilde{\chi}V_{\hat{E}}\big)(\chi w_{\hat{h},k}) &= \chi w_{\hat{h},k} + \chi\hat{E}^{-1}Rw_{\hat{h},k} + [\tilde{h}^2\partial_z^2, \chi]w_{\hat{h},k} \\ &= \chi w_{\hat{h},k} + o(\hat{h})_{L^2} + 2\tilde{h}^2\chi' w'_{\hat{h},k} + \tilde{h}^2\chi'' w_{\hat{h},k} \\ &= \chi w_{\hat{h},k} + o(\tilde{h})_{L^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.104}$$

The bottom line comes from the the inhomogeneous Agmon estimate and the fact that $\operatorname{supp}\chi' \cup \operatorname{supp}\chi'' \subset \{|z| > R_0\}$. The reason why we introduce the cut-off function $\tilde{\chi}$ is due to the fact

that $V_{\hat{E}}(z) \to z^2$ uniformly on compact sets, and consequently, $\tilde{\chi}(z)V_{\hat{E}}(z) \to \tilde{\chi}(z)z^2$ uniformly on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$.

It suffices to show that $\|\chi w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2(z>0)} \geq \delta > 0$ for some positive constant δ. Again, we argue by contradiction and appeal to the semiclassical measure. For this purpose, we suppose that up to the extraction of a subsequence, $w_{\hat{h},k}$ is pure, and that $\|\chi w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2(z>0)} = o(1)$. Denote by μ the $\tilde{h}$-semiclassical measure to $\chi w_{\hat{h},k}$. Then for every $q \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} o(\tilde{h}) &= \big(q(z,\tilde{h}D)\big(-\tilde{h}^2\partial_z^2 + \tilde{\chi}V_{\hat{E}} - 1\big)(\chi w_{\hat{h},k}), \chi w_{\hat{h},k}\big)_{L^2} \\ &= \big(b_{\hat{E}}(z,\tilde{h}D)(\chi w_{\hat{h},k}), \chi w_{\hat{h},k}\big)_{L^2} + o(\hat{h}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.105}$$

where $b_{\hat{E}}(z,\zeta) = q(z,\zeta)\big(\zeta^2 + \tilde{\chi}(z)V_{\hat{E}}(z) - 1\big) \to b_0(z,\zeta) = q(z,\zeta)\big(\zeta^2 + \tilde{\chi}(z)z^2 - 1\big)$ in $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R})$. Therefore, letting $\tilde{h} \to 0$, by Corollary 3.8, we have

$$0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} q(z,\zeta)\left(\zeta^2 + \tilde{\chi}(z)z^2 - 1\right)\mathrm{d}\mu(z,\zeta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} q(z,\zeta)\left(\zeta^2 + z^2 - 1\right)\mathrm{d}\mu(z,\zeta). \tag{3.106}$$

since evidently, $\operatorname{supp}\mu \subset \operatorname{supp}\chi \times \mathbb{R}$, on which $\tilde{\chi} \equiv 1$. Therefore,

$$\operatorname{supp}\mu \subset \{(z,\zeta) : \zeta^2 + z^2 = 1\}. \tag{3.107}$$

As for the propagation of the measure, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} o(1) &= \frac{i}{\tilde{h}}\big(\big[q(z,\tilde{h}D), -\tilde{h}^2\partial_z^2 + \tilde{\chi}(z)V_{\hat{E}}(z) - 1\big](\chi w_{\hat{h},k}), \chi w_{\hat{h},k}\big)_{L^2} \\ &= \big(c_{\hat{E}}(z,\tilde{h}D)(\chi w_{\hat{h},k}), \chi w_{\hat{h},k}\big)_{L^2} + O(\tilde{h}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.108}$$

where $c_{\hat{E}}(z,\zeta) = \big\{q(z,\zeta), \zeta^2 + \tilde{\chi}(z)V_{\hat{E}}(z)\big\} \to c_0(z,\zeta) = \big\{q(z,\zeta), \zeta^2 + \tilde{\chi}(z)z^2\big\}$ in $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R})$. Letting $\tilde{h} \to 0$, using Corollary 3.8 again,

$$0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} \big\{q(z,\zeta), \zeta^2 + \tilde{\chi}(z)z^2\big\}\,\mathrm{d}\mu(z,\zeta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} \big\{q(z,\zeta), \zeta^2 + z^2\big\}\,\mathrm{d}\mu(z,\zeta). \tag{3.109}$$

So μ is invariant by the Hamiltonian flow generated by the Hamiltonian vector field

$$\dot{z} = 2\zeta,\ \dot{\zeta} = -2z \tag{3.110}$$

which is nowhere degenerated on $\big\{(z,\zeta) : \zeta^2 + z^2 = 1\big\}$. Since $\|\chi w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2(z>0)} = o(1)$, μ is zero on $\mathbb{R}\times(0,\infty)$. Therefore, μ should be identically zero. We will get a contradiction if we can show that μ is nonzero. It is a one-dimensional special case which has already been dealt with by the proof of Proposition 3.10 (indeed, we treat the equation (3.100) in exactly the same way as the equation (3.29)), which says that $\chi w_{\hat{h},k}$ is $\tilde{h}$-oscillating, and consequently $\mu \neq 0$ since $\|\chi w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2} = 1 + o(1)$.

Thus we finish the proof of the following proposition.

Proposition 3.28. *Let $\{w_{\hat{h},k} : k = k(\hat{h})\}_{\hat{h}\to 0}$ be a sequence which is pure and normalized in norm $\|w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2} = 1$, with $\hat{E} = 1 - \hat{h}^2k(\hat{h})^2 \gg \hat{h}$ as $\hat{h} \to 0$, then $\|w_{\hat{h},k}\|_{L^2(z>0)} \geq \delta > 0$ for some δ and all sufficiently small $\hat{h}$.*

References

[A-G] Alinhac, S., Gérard, P. Pseudo-differential operators and the Nash-Moser theorem, translated from the 1991 French original by Stephen S. Wilson. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 82.

[Arn] Arnold, V. I. (2006). Ordinary differential equations. Translated from the Russian by Roger Cooke. Second printing of the 1992 edition. Universitext.

[B-L-R] Bardos, C., Lebeau, G., Rauch, J. (1992). Sharp sufficient conditions for the observation, control, and stabilisation of waves from the boundary. SIAM journal on control and optimization, 30(5), 1024-1065.

[Bee] Beekmann, B. (1990). Eigenfunctions and Eigenvalues on Surfaces of Revolution. Results in Mathematics, 17(1-2), 37-51.

[Bes] Besse, A. L. (2012). Manifolds all of whose geodesics are closed (Vol. 93). Springer Science & Business Media.

[Bur-1] Burq, N. (2002). Semi-classical estimates for the resolvent in nontrapping geometries. International Mathematics Research Notices, 2002(5), 221-241.

[Bur-2] Burq, N. (1997). Mesures semi-classiques et mesures de défaut. Séminaire Bourbaki, 39, 167-195.

[B-G] Burq, N., Gérard, P. (2002). Contrôle optimal des equations aux derivées partielles. Ecole polytechnique, Département de mathématiques.

[D-S] Dimassi, M., & Sjöstrand, J. (1999). Spectral asymptotics in the semi-classical limit (No. 268). Cambridge university press.

[Fed] Fedoryuk, M. V. (1993). Asymptotic analysis: linear ordinary differential equations. Springer Verlag.

[Hör] Hörmander, L. (2007). The analysis of linear partial differential operators III: Pseudo-differential operators (Vol. 274). Springer Science & Business Media.

[Leb] Lebeau, G. (1996). Equation des ondes amorties (pp. 73-109). Springer Netherlands.

[Olv] Olver, F. W. (2014). Asymptotics and special functions. Academic press.

[R-T] Rauch, J., Taylor, M. (1975). Decay of solutions to nondissipative hyperbolic systems on compact manifolds. Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, 28(4), 501-523.

[S-W] Stein, E. M., Weiss, G. Introduction to Fourier analysis on Euclidean spaces. 1971. Princeton, New Jersey.

[Zua] Zuazua, E. (2007). Controllability and observability of partial differential equations: some results and open problems. Handbook of differential equations: evolutionary equations, 3, 527-621.

[Zwo] Zworski, M. (2012). Semiclassical analysis (Vol. 138). American Mathematical Soc..